THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

To Professor OSCAR CULLMANN'S profound erudition and facile pen we owe still another most interesting and informative book—*The State in the New Testament.*[1] It is a small volume containing a brief course of lectures which he delivered in a number of Theological Colleges in America in 1955. As he points out in his Preface the relationship of Church and State has been of interest and concern ever since the beginning of Christianity. At times it has been a more acute problem than at others. We think of Totalitarian States which have grievously persecuted or seriously restricted the Church, or, on the other hand, of attempts by churches to erect themselves into theocracies. Yet even in peaceful times when Church and State are co-existing in quietness and friendly relations the problem remains; and every Christian should consider deeply what attitude he as a Christian should take towards the State. It is fairly obvious to common sense that both of two extremes are wrong—either that the Christian should renounce the State completely, or that he should believe that he must obey whatever the State may demand. CULLMANN'S view is that in the New Testament we find quite explicit the guiding principle.

We must begin with the position adopted by Jesus in the distressful political situation that confronted Him in the Palestine of His day. Towards the Roman occupying Power very different attitudes were adopted among the Jews.

The Sadducees were collaborationists. The Pharisees, for the most part, were sullen acquiescents cherishing a hope of Divine intervention to restore Jewish freedom and independence. Over against both was the resistance movement of the Zealots who thought that their own fighting spirit should be given free vent. Now the value of CULLMAN'S work here is in showing us what a problem for Jesus the Zealots presented. We all know about Jesus *versus* the Pharisees or the Sadducees; few know anything of Jesus *versus* the Zealots. Jesus, we are shown, had more connexion with the Zealots than most of us imagine. One of His disciples was or had been a Zealot—Simon Zelotes. The person designated in the Synoptics as Simon the Canaanite is clearly one with Simon the Zealot of Luke. Canaanite is a misunderstanding of the Aramaic *Kenana* which means 'Zealot.' What about Iscariot? Often the name has been explained as Ish Kerioth. The trouble is that nobody has ever discovered such a place as Kerioth. CULLMANN suggests that 'Iscariot' represents *Sicarius*—the Latin designation of 'Zealot.' Even Peter may have had a connexion with Zealotism. Bar-Jona very doubtfully means 'son of John.' Bariona is an Accadian word for 'terrorist'; and we cannot forget that in Gethsemane Peter was armed with a sword. Further, the sons of Zebedee in their desire to destroy the Samaritans are rather Zealot-like.

Jesus attracted the favour of the Zealots. They completely misunderstood His teaching about the coming of the Kingdom of God; and more than once Jesus had to resist the temptation to fall in with their ideas that the Kingdom of God was to be established by violence.

Very illuminating is CULLMANN'S exposition of the trial of Jesus. We must grasp that it was the Roman, not the Jewish authority that sent Him to the Cross, and that He was executed, not as a blasphemer, but as an alleged Zealot. Very valuable here are the remarks on the so-called trial before the Jewish Council. How often has it been declaimed that the Jewish authorities in their trial of Jesus broke many of their own regulations for the conduct of trials? Jewish jurisprudence was extraordinarily merciful in dealing with an accused person. In the case of Jesus, it is said, the Court ignored nearly all the rules for a fair trial. Now all that is quite a misunderstanding. The trial by night was not a formal trial at all, but a preliminary examination of the accused with a view to drawing up an indictment that would stand. It took place, not before a Council, properly convened, but was conducted by some members of the Council, hastily summoned; as, indeed, Matthew expressly states, the Council formally met next morning. For the clearest account of the trial which sent Jesus to the Cross

[1] S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net.

CULLMANN prefers the Fourth Gospel, which enshrines, he thinks, better traditions than the Synoptics.

The keynote to the attitude of Jesus to the State which Christians of all times should follow lies in the saying : ' Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's ; and unto God the things that are God's.' The State is not permanent as the Kingdom of God is, but for the here and now the State by God's ordinance fulfills certain functions necessary for human well-being, and it must be supported in that task by the Christian. But if the State becomes totalitarian and deifies itself or claims power to regulate for what is God's sphere, it must be resisted, but not as the Zealots thought with physical violence. ' They that take the sword shall perish by the sword.' In that sentence Jesus was probably thinking of the Zealots, and how truly He spoke !

Jesus agreed with the Zealots in taking seriously the expectation of the Kingdom of God, the existing Roman State was not an ultimate Divine institution. But He separates Himself sharply from them in so far as they endeavoured to bring in God's Kingdom on their own by human strength.

CULLMANN deals next with St. Paul's attitude to the State. In one place St. Paul says : ' Let every man be subject to the powers prevailing over us,' and goes on to give high place to even the heathen rulers as God's servants (Ro $13^{1ff.}$). Some have so misunderstood this passage as to think that Christians are required to endorse and abet all acts, even the crimes, of a Totalitarian State. That would contradict the view of Jesus and contradict what St. Paul says elsewhere. Along with Ro 13 we must consider 1 Co $6^{1ff.}$ where the Apostle deprecates Christians bringing their controversies before the State's Courts of Justice. The existence of the State will not be threatened if Christians avoid bringing litigation before the Courts and settle matters in dispute among themselves. This does not mean that the Church should take over the other affairs of the State. It gives no real support to the view that the State ought to be replaced by a ' rule of the saints,' or be suffered to exist only as the executive arm of the Church, as mediaeval Popes conceived.

Then there is the Book of Revelation. Every one feels the extraordinary difference of attitude towards the Roman State here expressed. Here Caesar is not a servant of God to whom respect is due. He is something unutterably foul, rising from the pit to destroy God's people. What is attacked is not Caesar as supreme magistrate, but Caesar claiming worship as God. So long as magistrates regarded Christians as a Jewish sect, Christians were safe ; for the Jews were exempt from the law enjoining Caesar-worship. But now that Nero knows that Christians are not Jews, but some *novum genus*, Christians must either worship Caesar or take the dire consequences of refusal.

There is no contradiction in the New Testament teaching as to the attitude of Christians to the State as Jesus and St. Paul had expressed it. Christians will be good citizens giving Caesar willing obedience in many things, but they will not grant to Caesar what is due to God alone. If he demands that, Caesar is not God's servant but devil-inspired.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that, guided by the New Testament, the Christian will be an exemplary citizen, but will keep a critical eye on the enactments of the State.

To carry the war into the enemy's country has always been considered a desirable strategic aim. It has its dangers, but it commonly meets with success. Some such reflection we may suppose to have been in the mind of a writer who has just published a comprehensive study of the strong position of the Christian faith in the contemporary world of unbelief.[1] The Christian believer, because of his minority status, must indeed beware of becoming conformed to that world, for in every sphere—philosophy, ethics, sociology, history, culture—there are doctrines current which neglect or reject God and generate an atmosphere alien to faith. On the other hand the Christian from his own distinctive viewpoint can show the inconsistencies, misinterpretations and partialities in the thinking of unbelievers and can point out, as the author before us seeks to do, that Christian categories offer a more consistent and adequate interpretation of these varied spheres of human knowledge and activity.

As an example of this method let us take what the writer has to say under the general heading of Faith and Culture about the autonomy of cultural activity, understanding culture to mean the artistic creativity of man in the arts and sciences. At the one extreme there is the situation which we used to suppose had passed away with the Middle Ages but which has become all too familiar again in our own time, where the powers that be, whether Church or State, political party or

[1] Mrs. Libuse Lukas Miller, *The Christian and the World of Unbelief* (Abingdon Press ; $4.75).

despotic dynasty, dictate to the creators of culture what the form and content of their creations shall be. At the other extreme there is a situation of cultural anarchy where every branch of creative activity pursues its own path in disregard of all the rest, experimenting and showing originality in certain directions but lacking interest in the meaning of the whole. On general principles it might be supposed that somewhere between these extremes there would be an ideal middle position, a golden mean; but such a position proves difficult to define, because the ideal differs according as one is considering the creators of culture or the people in general. For the former the state of anarchy is near the ideal, because there they have the complete freedom which the spontaneity of artistic creation demands. For the latter, however, the situation of dictatorship is more nearly the ideal, for in that case, though the culture in question may be forced on them and may be somewhat commonplace, yet just to that extent it performs the function of human communication which is a primary reason for its existence. The middle position, it would seem, cannot be really ideal for either party, but must be of the nature of a compromise.

Has the Church anything distinctive to say on this question of cultural autonomy, and, if so, is it something more satisfying? The Church too, suggests the author, if it is to be true to its message, must take a middle position; but that position is not a mere quantitative mean between the extremes, a kind of compromise or moderation for moderation's sake. Rather it is the concrete and particular moderation that results from an awareness of the nature of man—his wholeness, his creatureliness and his sinfulness. This kind of moderation, if it may be called such, is characteristic of that true Christian humanism which will not allow man to make himself either sub-human or superhuman, as in his alienation from God he is tempted to do, but insists that he remain simply human, a child of God made in the image of God. This is humanism, but with a difference, for in this Christian humanism it is not man who is the measure of all things, but it is God's intention for man that is the measure of all things. Man is fallen and is scarcely capable of taking his own measure, but the true nature of man, as the Christian faith understands it, gives a standard which may be used to evaluate cultural creativity. Every field of cultural endeavour must be allowed a relative autonomy, so that it may proceed according to its own native genius; but it must not seek to emancipate itself from an ultimate reference to the totality of human needs and possibilities. To put the point in the language of an earlier generation, the true slogan is not art for art's sake, but art for life's sake, and by life in this connexion is meant the true nature of man as the Christian faith perceives it. That is a middle position in this matter of cultural autonomy, but it is very different from a mere compromise, a prudential golden mean. It is a position more satisfying and distinctively Christian.

On the basis of this insight our author sees the task of the Church as twofold. There is first the slow unspectacular task of conversion and the cultural embodiment of its own faith, that is to say, the production of 'Christians who are not Christians by accident and poets, artists, scientists or philosophers by intent, nor Christians by intent and poets, artists, scientists or philosophers by accident; but who are both in one breath and by one calling.' If there is to be any Christian culture it is such Christians who will produce it. Secondly, there is the constant task of studying and criticising the general cultural activity of the age, first seeking to understand it with real sympathy and then to criticise it from the standpoint of a Christian interpretation of man's real nature and destiny. Christians who undertake this task will help to preserve such of the Christian culture of the past as deserves to be preserved, and they will also point lessons for the future. Real understanding is vital here, and that means an entering into and sharing the growing movements of the day. At this point the danger of being conformed to the unbelieving world cannot be avoided. To become submerged in the secular world, or to remain completely isolated from the secular world, are both disastrous. It is the old problem of being in the world, yet not of it; for the salt must not lose its savour, and yet it must be the salt of the earth, else it is as useless as if it had lost its savour.

On the whole, our author concludes, the greater danger threatening the Church at the present time, so far as this matter of culture is concerned, is to lapse into cultural isolation with a view to maintaining its purity of faith. Better, she thinks, to err on the side of taking up some new idea, even though it should turn out in the long run to be unfruitful. There is danger in trying to make the Christian faith invulnerable from without by theological definition or by legalistic morality or by some measures of that nature. The Church, in the power of a living relationship to a living God, should greet each new cultural idea, not with fear and suspicion, but rather with a calm curiosity, a healthy scepticism, and an adventurous sympathy, sure in the knowledge that God is not in danger, and that He may indeed be very well able to turn men's inventions, whatever they may be, to purposes known only to Himself.

Expository Problems

The Cry of Dereliction

By the Reverend David H. C. Read, M.A., B.D., D.D., New York

There is perhaps no other text in the New Testament that exerts such a strange compulsion on the preacher of the gospel as this Cry of the Crucified : ' My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? ' It both repels and attracts. It repels because of the shock such words on the Lord's lips inflict on our assumption of the untroubled serenity of His communion with the Father ; and it attracts because these words convey with unrivalled power both the profoundest mystery of the Atonement and our sense of identity with the Saviour. Woven into a sermon on suffering, reconciliation, or Divine sympathy, the Cry of Dereliction has a solemn power of conveying what no formula of our words can do. Therefore it has probably been cited more often in sermons than any other text of similar perplexity.

No serious expositor has ever claimed to have reached a definitive understanding of this Cry, and the recorded attempts are bewildering in their variety. We should note right away that the expression ' The Cry of Dereliction,' which has been current in the Church for centuries, itself implies an exegesis that is by no means universally acceptable. Critical and theological assumptions have naturally played a large part in determining the meaning to be given to the words and will in the end probably determine the use to which they will be put in our preaching. We are also exposed, in our understanding of such a text, to the contemporary conditions under which we hear the Word. It is my belief that it awakens a more profound response in mid-twentieth-century man than it would have, shall we say, in the England of Addison or the Scotland of Hume.

Our first concern must naturally be with the question of authenticity. Were the words, ' My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? ' actually spoken by Jesus from the Cross, or do they form part of an artificial framework of Old Testament allusion in which the Crucifixion narrative has been set ? In the afterglow of the literary-critical victory over the literalists the prevailing fashion among a generation of critics and expositors was to detect non-historical editing everywhere in the recorded words and actions of Jesus. In particular, if any word attributed to Him could be traced to another source, or explained as a later gloss, its authenticity tended to be, *ipso facto*, denied. Scholars have now in general resiled from this position, and, although the question of whether at any point we have the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus is theoretically an open one, the dependent preacher has been given greater confidence in his use of the Logia.

The facts are that this text appears in Mark and Matthew, with slight variants, and in both Gospels these are the only words recorded as spoken from the Cross. The argument against their authenticity rests on the belief that the Crucifixion narrative has been edited under the impulse to record a literal fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, particularly in the details of the Twenty-second Psalm. The quotation of the first verse of that psalm is thus held to have been inserted as a supplement to the statement that ' Jesus cried with a loud voice ' (Mk 15^{37}). It is also objected that the bystanders (*v.* 35) could hardly have understood the Divine name, uttered either in Hebrew or Aramaic (and there is manuscript evidence for both) as ' Elijah.' It is surely possible to eliminate this objection on the grounds that the words of an agonizing man could easily be misunderstood, without having recourse to the theory that it was the pagan spectators who made the mistake and imagined that Jesus was calling on Helios, the Sun God (C. H. Turner, *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*). Of the main objection it can surely be said that, even allowing for the Matthæan predilection for Old Testament prophecy, there is no plausible reason why *this* quotation should have been selected to set on the lips of Jesus. For, from the beginning, it was a major difficulty for the Christian expositor, and there is manuscript evidence that attempts were made to whittle down the full impact of the words. That the words are found, spoken by Jesus, in our earliest source, and that it is inconceivable that an early disciple would have dared to put them on His lips—these are surely major reasons for accepting their authenticity.

There follows the question of their interpretation. The real difficulty arises within the framework of an orthodox Christology. For if our Lord were simply the most inspired of the rabbis, or the greatest religious genius of His race, it is no major problem that He should die with an expression of bewildered abandonment. Again,

if we follow an extreme eschatological interpretation, and believe that Jesus expected to be revealed as Son of Man before the end and thus died disappointed, the text becomes more a confirmation than a problem. It is for those who believe that the sinless Son of God was on the Cross offering Himself voluntarily as a sacrifice for the sin of the world that the question becomes acute : was this Christ actually abandoned by God at this point ?—a conception logically irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Trinity ; or did He feel Himself to be so abandoned ?—a conception scarcely less difficult to reconcile with orthodox Christology.

It is clear even in the framing of such questions that we are in an area where the ordinary categories of human thought and logic are hopelessly inadequate. Just as no fully satisfactory formulation of the mystery of Christ's Person has ever been discovered (Chalcedonia notwithstanding), so no human mind can expect to penetrate into the supreme mystery of the action of God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. Yet, unless we are never to attempt an exposition of these words at all, we must strive to reach some point of deeper understanding.

There are, of course, ways of softening the full impact of the words. It can be pointed out, for instance, that the words themselves certainly do not imply any loss of *faith* in God, for it is still 'My God' who is addressed. Again, great stress has been laid by expositors on the fact that this is a quotation. It is a perfectly plausible suggestion that our Lord was repeating in His agony the entire psalm, only the first words of which were heard, or recorded. And the psalm, as we know, passes from despair to confidence and praise. 'For he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted ; *neither hath he hid his face from him* ; but when he cried unto him, he heard' (*v.* 24). In this way we are to conceive of our Lord vicariously expressing through the Scriptures the experience of filial trust holding on through agony and loneliness and shame. A sermon might well be constructed on this understanding of the text. It would offer a moving and realistic interpretation of those hours on the Cross, and relieve the minds of those who have been distressed by the apparent hopelessness of the words removed from their context. What could be more natural at such a terrible moment than the repetition of a psalm—learned probably in childhood ? There are many examples from recent experience in war of men in agony on the battlefield, or in the horror of solitary confinement, grasping for the promise of Scriptures that they had once committed to memory.

Such an interpretation, however, not only ignores the exegesis of many of the saints and Fathers of the Church : it fails to account for the deliberate selection of these words by the first two Gospels, and the emphasis given them by their isolation. If neither Matthew nor Mark record any other utterance from the Cross, it must be because their sources had faithfully and uniquely preserved these words. Why ? It is not fanciful to suppose that this was an echo from Calvary that could not be suppressed. Luke may have avoided it because of the comment about Elijah that would have been meaningless to his Gentile readers ; John because of the different pattern of his account. But here is evidence of a tradition that could hardly be distorted—for who would try to insert such a word into the narrative ? If the tradition were to the effect that the whole psalm was muttered by Jesus in His agony, why should this particular utterance be selected for the record ? Such considerations lead us towards an interpretation which takes seriously the expression of abandonment on Jesus' lips.

No approach to such a radical understanding of the words can be made outside the context of the New Testament doctrine of atonement. If the death of Jesus was simply demonstrative, or evocative, it would be impossible to attach real meaning to a sense of abandonment. But if we accept the Apostolic witness that in and through Jesus, God was at work 'for us,' then His death is invested with supreme significance. It is the climax of a life lived for us, experience undergone for us, and humiliation endured for us. The familiar passage from Philippians (2^{5-11}) describes the saving action of Christ as a parabola of grace. The steps of descent—humiliation—are set before us : 'made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men'—here is incarnation and with it comes atonement—'and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' Then follow the steps of ascent, whereby the victorious Lord enters into His inheritance.

If we interpret the steps of Christ's descent as a progressive identification of Himself with sinful man, we find that the experience of death itself is, as it were, not made the final humiliation. It is 'even the death of the cross.' Surely the reference here is not only to the utter horror of a common criminal's execution under Roman law, but to the extreme limits of suffering endured by the Saviour on our behalf. 'The death of the cross' implies more than the physical suffering and the public degradation ; it surely speaks of the final horror that awaits mankind—that of separation from God. Does it not conform with Paul's thought elsewhere that on the Cross 'he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin'

(2 Co 5^{21}) ? For sin is separation from God, and the experience of Christ on our behalf, if it were to be absolute, must have included that to which sin leads, though not actual sin itself.

This, then, is a real Cry of Dereliction—as real as all else suffered ' for us.' Such an interpretation, whatever difficulties attend it, cannot be dismissed as an elaboration on the mythologizing of St. Paul. For the Gospels are impregnated with this same thought of Christ's identification with man. This is the meaning of the Baptism : ' Suffer it to be so now : for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness ' (Mt 3^{15}). This is the thought behind every reference to the servant, and to the destiny of the Son of Man. Christ comes to share all life, to experience every step of the way in which man has gone astray, to know pain, loneliness, abandonment—and to know all this as the Reconciler, blazer of the trail back to God.

It would seem then that atonement could not be complete, the experience would be unfulfilled, unless He had also been where sin is ' when it is finished '—the death of the soul. This is hell—separation from God—and many have felt with Calvin that these words from the Cross are the best commentary on the profession of the Creed : ' He descended into hell.'

What can possibly be said to make such a conception articulate in terms of a self-consistent theology ? Surely all that we may say is that here—at the deepest point in the expression of atonement—logical formulæ are as impossible as at the deepest point in our understanding of incarnation. Just as, beyond the edges of our mind, we hold on to the fact that it is God Almighty who was incarnate in the man Jesus ; so, as far beyond, we hold on to the fact that even in this dereliction ' *God* was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.'

It will not have escaped the sensitive preacher that in this Cry we have the echo of—and the only answer to—the most poignant and insistent cry of mankind : ' My God, why ? ' When we have discovered how impossible it is to provide a logical answer to the problem of innocent suffering, at moments when the arguments of the apologists are as a ' tinkling cymbal,' the Cry from the Cross speaks as nothing else can ever speak. For it shows us absolute Innocence in absolute abandonment—yet out of that abyss there comes the ultimate word of reconciliation and of peace. Twentieth-century man can understand that ' He went through hell for us,' and find in such a Saviour—not the solution of a riddle—but an answer to despair.

Literature

A GREAT NEW TESTAMENT LEXICON

THERE are some books which, as soon as they are published, must rank as indispensable tools for the scholar. Beyond any doubt such is *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, and Other Early Christian Literature*, by Professor William F. Arndt and Professor F. Wilbur Gingrich (Cambridge University Press and the University of Chicago Press ; £5, 5s. net). The sub-title of the book explains what it is—' A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, fourth revised and augmented edition 1952.'

The genesis of this book is extremely interesting. In 1947 the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod observed its centennial. A part of the thank-offering fund was set aside as a fund for scholarly research. The Lutheran Academy of Scholarship decided that the money should be used to help this project which now comes completed to our hands. All New Testament scholars in this country—even the comparative few who work as easily in German as in English—will rise up and call that Synod and that Academy blessed.

This book is at once a concordance and a dictionary to the New Testament in Greek. It further illustrates each word from the Early Fathers, from non-Christian sources, and from the papyri. And in very many cases at the end of the paragraph on the word there are appended references to work on the word done in books and in articles up to as late as 1954.

It is quite clear that the value of this book will only become apparent with the continuous use of it. But even on a first examination of it it is clear that its layout is not only of first-class lexicographical, but also of first-class theological importance. Let us take, for instance, its classifications of the word *hamartia*. It lists them as follows. (1) The action itself, as well as its result (*hamartēma*), every departure from the way of righteousness, both human and Divine. (2) In Johannine usage *hamartia* is conceived as a condition or a characteristic quality and is opposed to *alētheia*. (3) Paul thinks of sin in personal terms. (4) In Hebrews (as in the Old Testament) sin appears as the power which deceives

men and leads them to destruction, whose influence and activity can be ended only by sacrifices. (5) The article concludes with a section on special sins; and there follow no fewer than twenty-five lines of references to books and articles on the subject of *hamartia*. That is a typical example of the way in which this Lexicon works. And it can be seen that here we have not only the linguistic examination of the word *hamartia*, but all the raw materials for a full theological discussion of it.

Bauer's own lengthy introduction is concluded, and it is safe to say that there is nowhere a better summary of the origin and characteristics of *koinē* Greek.

The book is beautifully printed and produced. A translation of Bauer's great work was a long-felt want. Now we have even more than a translation. It is safe to say that this book will seldom be out of the hands of those who study the Greek New Testament. And it must be noted that the preacher also, who knows enough Greek to handle a volume like this, will find more subjects for sermons and expositions than in a collection of volumes of sermons which might cost twenty times as much.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

The Ecumenical Movement has brought more than one New Testament scholar to concern himself with the nature of the Church in relation to the work of Christ. We have, for instance, R. Newton Flew's 'Jesus and His Church,' and the first chapter of T. W. Manson's 'The Church's Ministry.' Emil Brunner amongst others has also attacked the problem in his 'Das Misverständnis der Kirche.' One expects both learning and ingenuity from Dr. Anders Nygren, the illustrious author of 'Agape and Eros,' and he does not disappoint us in either respect in his recent small work, *Christ and His Church*, translated by Alan Carlstan (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). Dr. Nygren has taken an intimate and thoughtful interest in the Ecumenical Movement, having been present at Faith and Order Conferences in Edinburgh (1937) and Lund (1952) as well as at the first assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam (1948). Such experience has convinced him that to attain real Unity we must 'pursue the relevant questions to their central issues,' and must concentrate our attention upon the Church as the Body of Christ, Christ Himself constituting the Unity of the Church. His main emphasis is upon the inseparable unity between Christ and His Church with the conclusions and action to which we should be led by recognition that 'it lies in the nature of the Church that it cannot be more than one.'

Dr. Nygren traces the evolution of the Messianic concept in the Old Testament period and discusses fully its transformation and realization in Christ, examining carefully the Biblical passages dealing with the Baptism of Jesus, the Temptations, the Confession of Peter, the Agony in Gethsemane, the Submission on the Cross. He then proceeds with his thesis that the suffering of Christ was representative, the Crucifixion 'the decisive moment for the destiny of all mankind,' such as are 'in Christ' being in the Body of Christ which is the Church. The 'Body of Christ' is not to be identified with a universal organization. The writer makes the interesting point that Christ's temptation to be a Messiah-King instead of a vicarious Messiah-Servant is also a temptation for His Church. He holds that Christ is present in the visible society wherein His word is preached and His sacrament administered. 'Where this takes place, there is the body of Christ, there is the ecclesia of Christ.' Calvin said almost exactly the same, and, as Dr. Nygren indicates, so did Luther. The conclusion reached is that we must start from the given Unity of the Church in Christ. If we begin thus, the author is persuaded that discussion of differences will result, not in judgments of one another, but in a common struggle to help each other toward the whole truth. This seems optimistic, but does it ultimately amount to more than a recommendation that Christians should be Christian?

G. D. HENDERSON

CONVERSION

The subject of conversion is one which the Church neglects at her peril. Many of the greatest servants of the Church found the starting point of their effective Christian life in a memorable experience of the transforming power of God, usually spoken of as their conversion; and in recent times the popular interest in large-scale evangelistic campaigns has made the subject one of current importance.

Dr. Erik Routley, Chaplain of Mansfield College, Oxford, chooses this opportune moment for the publication of his book—*The Gift of Conversion* (Lutterworth Press; 18s. 6d. net). If any one wishes for a calm, dispassionate and cautious discussion of the subject this is not the book for him. If, however, he enjoys finding conventional judgments and treasured preconceptions challenged, and hearing unusual and disturbing points of view vigorously championed, if he welcomes that which provokes thought and discussion, and even opposition, this is a book to his taste.

The opening chapter discusses the so-called 'conversion' experiences of Paul, Augustine, and Wesley. For some reason Luther is not included

in their company. Provokingly enough the chapter is entitled 'Mythology.' This is because the author believes that in people's minds these 'conversions' have become standardized as norms of Christian conversion, and in consequence have imposed a regrettable regimentation upon the experience of other Christians. They have become, in the jargon of up-to-date theology, 'myths.' Dr. Routley subjects these three conversion experiences to detailed analysis, shows that they are less alike than is often supposed, and finds their common factor in a new experience of 'freedom.' Next the uses of the word 'convert' in the Bible are examined, and one example of conversion, the story of Bartimæus, is expounded in very great detail. This is treated as if it were the true 'myth' of conversion. The state which characterizes pre-conversion is described as 'anxiety,' as Tillich uses the word, 'anxiety of death, of guilt, and of meaninglessness,' and freedom from these anxieties is the characteristic mark of conversion.

The next main section is a long discussion of the contrast between Law and Grace, both as a principle of life, and also as a recurring theme in the Bible, but it does not seem very closely related to the main subject of the book. The concluding chapters argue that conversion must be thought of as essentially an 'ontological' phenomenon, and only derivatively as a moral one, and consider the place of conversion in the aim of the preacher and in the life of the Church.

This is not a book which plods along steadily, but goes in fits and starts. Sometimes we read what is very good indeed, and sometimes what is exasperatingly inadequate, inconsistent, and even demonstrably wrong. The best page in the book is the brief appendix of positive conclusions about conversions. This is excellent. Twelve affirmations about conversion are clearly and succinctly enunciated. Alas to say it! they had not really emerged at all clearly in the book itself. Digressions, onslaughts upon supposed opponents, dogmatic and not always well-founded assertions, and what the author himself admits are 'difficult and chancy contentions' divert the reader's mind from the more positive features of the book. No one who has read this book will be merely indifferent to it. In some it will arouse enthusiasm, in others resentment and irritation. But every one will remember it!

In conclusion let us allow the author to speak positively for himself and his theme: 'Conversion is not expertness. It is not knowledge. It is not skill in the pursuit of theology. It is not church work. It is not the sacred ministry. It is not a feeling of pleasure. It is not enthusiasm. It is the process by which a man is received into the presence of God, that as a child he may say, "Abba, Father."' 'Conversion acts upon anxiety and transforms it into assurance; it acts upon fear and transforms it into courage; it acts upon duty and transforms it into love.'

C. L. MITTON

PAIN AND HEALING

Mental Pain and the Cure of Souls, by the Rev. H. Guntrip, B.D., Ph.D. (Independent Press; 10s. 6d. net), is the author's most ambitious attempt to make the fruits of psycho-analytical thought and psychotherapeutic practice available for the working pastor; although, with Professor Grensted in his Foreword, I trust it will be read by many psychiatrists.

The book is too condensed to summarize; and only a general idea of its rich contents can be given.

It is divided into three parts. Part one deals with *Mental Pain*—its definition, its nature, its origin, the various forms of anxiety which it embodies and the tensions in the unconscious which give rise to it. There are excellent descriptions of the unconscious elements which give rise to the schizoid and depressive types of personality. A digression into the history of psycho-analysis is valuable as showing the tremendous advances on Freudian theory. Instinct was the basis of Freudian psychology, and is still used by many psychiatrists as an easy explanation of personal disturbances. Here we have: *Instinct is potentiality and basic need, not specific impulse existing prior to experience.* He follows Fairbairn's idea that the unconscious *is not a striving for libidinal pleasure but a seeking for good-object-relationships.* Our mental history can be explained by the endeavour to defend ourselves against the bad objects (parents, teachers, etc.) and to find the good objects. His chapter on the complex and multiple structure of personality is choke full of excellent analysis with well-chosen illustrations.

Part two deals with *Mental Defences.* Here we have all the tricks of the mind by which it defends itself against the bad objects, the mental pain, depression, phobias and paranoid tendencies. The various types of personalities are well illustrated.

In part three he deals with *Mental Healing*, giving real insight into the difficulties of becoming a 'real person,' matured, self-possessed; psychotherapeutic methods, the conditions in which a successful relationship between psychotherapist and patient can be established. Finally, the whole is linked with religious experience.

I had all sorts of illuminating sentences marked for quotation but alas! space forbids. I have just room for a word of constructive criticism.

Is Dr. Guntrip not following Fairbairn too closely and making the child too much the outcome of

parental pressures ? What about the child's own individuality and initiative? It is not the parent he introjects either as good or bad object, but the child's idea of the parent, an imago, which never corresponds to the parent. He does admit the good parent but with great qualifications ! ! I wonder if we do not make the parent the scapegoat for the child's own moral weakness and the adolescent's defiance of moral authority ? I cannot agree with his criticism of Maeder's ' brief psychotherapy.' There are many who need no more, otherwise counselling would not be so successful, nor would there be any hope of the minister doing much good. I hope I don't sound carping. There is so much that is good here, that no criticism can take away from its value.

A second edition will be called for and printing errors should be noted on pages 26 and 132. Also Professor McKenzie's initials are J.G., not J.S. The book is worthy a better format and larger print.

JOHN G. MCKENZIE

A COMMENTARY FOR THE LAY PREACHER

Most students of homiletics have had flung at them the horrid, and probably apocryphal, example of the preacher who said : ' Don't do as I do, do as I tell you.' It may be that Dr. C. Leslie Mitton had this in mind during the writing of a volume in the series of which he is himself editor. Be that as it may, he has had good success in the task. *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (Epworth Press ; 2s. 6d. net) in the ' Epworth Preacher's Commentaries ' is a model of what the series is meant to be. The book is not written for those happy to possess and able to use Swete, Rawlinson, or Taylor, but for those called to preach the Word of God and having to rely on simpler aids to study. For them Dr. Mitton, with the rare gift of scholarly simplicity, brings the fruits of wide reading and deep understanding. All that is written here is well within the comprehension of those for whom it is written but, as they follow the text of St. Mark with its help, they can expect to have their minds stretched.

The Introduction is brief but sufficient. The chapters follow those of St. Mark. They are expounded, section by section and each with summary title, to reconstruct the original scene and to explain what it meant to those originally seeing and hearing. Herein are inserted detailed comments, for example, the significance of the Greek word translated ' Be still ' in 4^{39}. These are usually succinct and to the point but where necessary are enlarged, as, for example, in $3^{28ff.}$, to give an admirable account of the Unforgivable Sin. At appropriate places issues of importance or difficulty are treated fully, for example, the meaning and use of parable at $4^{1ff.}$; and of miracle at $4^{35ff.}$. Here in less than a thousand words Dr. Mitton states the problem, discusses various views, and without spoon-feeding leaves the reader with material to make up his own mind. Thus, and in other ways, Dr. Mitton leads the exposition from the *then* of the Gospel story, to the *now* of believing and doing.

Comment is related to other parts of Scripture, for example, to the meaning of Son of Man ; to secular literature, for example, an inspired quotation from C. L. Lewis's autobiography concerning ' Legion ' ; and to other commentaries, for example, Taylor on Mk 13. In addition to a general index there are lists of suggested texts and themes for sermons. These, as with much in the Commentary, are so good as to be too short. Nevertheless, within the limits prescribed by the publishers, this is a notable achievement, sure to be of great value to those new to the art of using a commentary to divide the Word of God.

MARCUS WARD

DOES PHILOSOPHY EXIST ?

This volume—*Contemporary British Philosophy* —the third in the ' Muirhead Library of Philosophy ' series, with contributions from a score of outstanding philosophers (Allen and Unwin ; 35s. net), encourages a decidedly affirmative answer to the above question, Does Philosophy Exist ? with, of course, varying degrees in the intensity of appreciation. The editor, Professor H. D. Lewis, is slightly afraid of producing confusion of mind by the variety of the fare provided, and gives us the excellent advice that we may avoid intellectual indigestion by reading first ' the polished and witty contribution ' by Professor H. J. Paton, who certainly shows with clarity the relationships of the various schools of philosophy during the early half of our century. He apologizes for his Oxford point of view, but is definitely aware even of Cambridge, heightening the contrast by quoting the epigram that ' an Oxford man knows less and less about more and more till he knows nothing about everything ; a Cambridge man knows more and more about less and less till he knows everything about nothing.' It is greatly to be regretted that this contrast could not have been still further heightened by the inclusion amongst the contributors to this volume of the late Professor John Laird, a typical representative in many ways of the Cambridge spirit, but the sarcasm with which the epigram concludes would have been unfair to Laird (cf. ' Proceedings of the British Academy,' vol. 33). Professor Paton tells us fascinatingly of the development of philosophy in Oxford immediately

before and after the First World War, and more fully during the period from the Second World War onwards. When he returned to Oxford in 1937 he says 'the Cam was flowing into the Isis . . . and a fresh era had begun.' His generalized judgment is that post-War philosophy was very much alive, and he concludes, with exquisite courtesy to those from whom he differs, that the earlier idealism suffered from too little attention to science, that science has become less monopolistic, and the logic of linguistics is becoming more aware that no language can be used 'as a standard to which philosophical thinking must conform.'

But the editor need not have sheltered himself so modestly behind the article just referred to, for his own contribution on 'Worship and Idolatry' is a brilliant piece of work. He first of all calls for a more precise definition of the meaning of religion, holding that it must always involve awareness of a transcendent Being, and he takes up a middle position between those who hold the vapid idea that all religions are of equal value and those who argue that lower religions with their corruptions are due to original sin. This he thinks is a far too simple and anachronistic explanation; even primitive religions involve a revelation from above, but the sense of the transcendent often induces a 'resistance movement' in which the symbol is treated in reverse, and, instead of opening out to the Divine, 'incapsulates' the revelation in the symbol. This is more manageable, and, incorporating pridefulness with his reflections, the primitive worshipper is tempted to treat as sacrosanct the nearer object which is satisfying and also attractive on traditional grounds. Degraded forms of religions are often escapisms from the incursion of the Divine, but are not to be condemned as altogether dissociated from it.

Professor Mackinnon indicates a modified acceptance of ethical intuitionism but would try to hold the balance between this and utilitarianism. The latter is over-simplified, and does not allow sufficiently for the questioning restlessness of human life at its highest.

It is impossible to give a conjunct view of the variety of teaching in this volume, but on the whole it leads to an affirmative answer to the question with which we started, although some of the essays leave us rather disconsolately in the twilight of scepticism, and the dawning of light seems to be delayed.

W. S. URQUHART

THE EPISTLES TO THE COLOSSIANS AND TO PHILEMON

The announcement that the long-established Series of Cambridge Biblical Commentaries is to appear in a new form under the title of *The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary* is heartily to be welcomed. The older Series began in 1877 with 'The Cambridge Bible for Schools' (on the English text) and, shortly afterwards, with 'The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.' In succession to Professor A. M. Ramsey after his elevation to the see of Durham no better editor could have been found than Professor C. F. D. Moule, Fellow of Clare College and Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, for his 'Idiom Book of New Testament Greek' has revealed his exact and detailed knowledge of the language and did not conceal a lively interest in theology.

Professor Moule opens the new Series with *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Cambridge University Press; 21s. net). The Introduction discusses the religious thought of the Epistles and the circumstances which led to their composition. Here a most interesting and valuable section deals with the challenging views of E. J. Goodspeed and J. Knox, that Archippus rather than Philemon is addressed in the Epistle which goes under that name, and that Philemon himself was associated with Laodicea rather than Colossæ. Professor Moule is not able to accept these hypotheses and, as against several modern scholars, prefers to think that the Epistles were written, not at Ephesus, but during St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome. The notes on the text are as illuminating as they are scholarly, especially the discussion of the great Christological passage in Col 1^{15-20}. It is pleasing to note that, while the aim of the Series is to give increased attention to the theological and religious content of the New Testament, Professor Moule has not failed to give considerable attention to linguistic and historical questions. In a valuable Appendix he has supplied important notes on Christian greetings in letters, ἀπόστολος, the Knowledge of God, πλήρωμα, and the use of the reflexive pronoun.

One must regret, I think, that the new Commentary lacks a continuous form of the Greek text, still more that it is not provided with Indexes, and, further, that many important discussions have obviously had to be compressed. It is much to be hoped that these signs of economy in printing are not going to mark the Series as a whole, especially as the published price is not low. Every one must wish that this new Series will continue to maintain the great traditions of past Cambridge Commentaries, and Professor Moule's volume suggests that it will do so.

VINCENT TAYLOR

One of the tragedies of eighteenth-century Church History was the complete failure of John Wesley and Count Nicholas Ludwig of Zinzendorf

to work together. Dr. Clifford W. Towlson, in his book, *Moravian and Methodist* (Epworth Press; 25s. net), gives an excellent account of the relationships between the two communities throughout the eighteenth century, and in his concluding chapters tries to decide to what extent they influenced one another.

Dr. Towlson thinks that too much has been made of doctrinal differences in explaining the friction between Moravian and Methodist. He attaches more importance to John Wesley's 'suspicion of Zinzendorf's autocracy,' to his 'dislike of Moravian secretiveness, which seemed to him cowardly and dishonest' and to Moravian 'suspicion of Wesley's passion for power.' The doctrinal cleavages, he thinks, 'might have been reduced, if not bridged, by trust and goodwill.' The point is well made; one doubts if doctrinal agreement would have led to personal agreement between Zinzendorf and Wesley. But trust and good-will are in some ways a very modern solution for doctrinal distinctions: it was John Wesley's doctrine of Christian Perfection which helped to separate him not only from the Lutheran Count, for whom it was 'the error of errors,' but also from the Calvinistic evangelicals of the Church of England. The under-emphasis of doctrinal differences leads Dr. Towlson to say on p. 67 that 'if . . . Whitsuntide 1738 was a decisive event in the spiritual development of the two Wesleys,' then 'the thirteen million Methodists throughout the world are the spiritual heirs of a handful of German Christians.' John Wesley was far from becoming a Lutheran at Aldersgate Street, and it is less strange than Dr. Towlson thinks (cf. p. 87) that Wesley should react so strongly against Luther's interpretation of the Epistle to the Galatians: Luther's Commentary seemed to Wesley the flattest denial of the possibility of Christian Perfection.

The book contains a useful bibliography and is well indexed.

The present revision of the Canon Law of the Church of England gives point to the publication of the Lichfield Divinity Lectures for 1956 in the form of *An Introduction to Canon Law in the Church of England*, by Canon Eric W. Kemp, B.D., M.A. (Hodder and Stoughton; 8s. 6d.). The treatment is largely historical; but in the final chapter an attempt is made to draw some lessons for the present revision from the facts of the past. This is a useful introduction by an expert in a subject that has been much overlooked in recent times.

In August, 1954, we commented in Notes of Recent Exposition on a masterly study of Christian and Marxian views of history lately published in the U.S.A. by the Abingdon Press. We are glad to meet it now in a British edition—*Christianity, Communism and History*, by Dr. William Hordern (Lutterworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). We confirm our high estimate of this study, reminding readers that the author finds the similarities and divergences between Christianity and Communism illuminated by the social thinking of the Reformation sects, chiefly in seventeenth-century England.

The usual observance of the Three Hours Devotion on Good Friday is in the form of a sequence of devotional addresses on the Seven Words from the Cross interspersed with hymns and prayers. That form appears to have originated with the Jesuits and to have been introduced into the Church of England less than a century ago. On the basis of the Book of Common Prayer, however, a liturgical Three Hours Devotion can be framed, incorporating three sermons; and for the past ten years at St. Margaret's, Westminster, this has been the form in use, and Anglican theologians have been invited to expound our Lord's Passion in these sermons. Most of their addresses are now published under the title *Good Friday at St. Margaret's* (Mowbray; 7s. 6d. net) with an Introduction by Canon Charles Smyth explaining this form of observance of the Three Hours. These are not popular sermons, but the earnest reader will find them leading him deeper into the mystery of our redemption.

It is more than ten years since we first reviewed *Christian Worship, Its Making and Meaning*, by Professor Horton Davies, commending it as a popular yet reliable introduction to the subject. In the interval it has served, as was intended, as a text-book for discussion among young people, and it now appears in a revised edition, price 6s. net boards, 5s. limp, in the Pathfinder Series published by the Religious Education Press. We are glad to commend it again.

Durham Essays and Addresses (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net) consists of papers, ordination charges and sermons written by the present Archbishop of York while he was Bishop of Durham. He reveals a vigorous, sensitive and versatile Christian mind, rooted in the faith and alive to contemporary trends of opinion within and without the Church. If any one wishes to see how such a mind reacts to varied subjects like the parish communion, demythologizing, Christian theology and sociology, and contemporary questions about the ecumenical movement and Christian unity, let him read this book. He will be charmed and stimulated and, if he may not always agree, he will never be at a loss to know what the author means.

Eschatology and the Unity of New Testament Theology

By Professor George Eldon Ladd, Ph.D., Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California

Twenty years ago in his Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge University, C. H. Dodd called for a new emphasis upon the unity of New Testament thought in place of the analytic approach which had prevailed throughout the preceding century. The exclusive dominance of the analytic approach had 'led to a piecemeal treatment of early Christian thought, which in the end made it more difficult to understand the New Testament as a whole, and left the mind bewildered by its diversity.' [1]

This new trend has produced an extensive literature which we cannot here trace. The study of eschatology has contributed little to this search for a basic unity; on the contrary, the tendency has been to find the greatest measure of diversity in the eschatology of the several strata of New Testament thought. This may be most vividly illustrated by reference to two interpretations of New Testament eschatology. In his Inaugural Lecture Dodd recognized that eschatology must play a significant role in this quest for a fundamental unity.[2] But his own reconstruction of the history of New Testament eschatology accents diversity rather than unity. Jesus' view of the Kingdom was one of 'realized eschatology'; the eschatological kingdom *has come* in the life, death, resurrection, ascension and parousia of Jesus. According to Dodd these constituted facets of a single event. For Jesus, there was a single day of victory. The Resurrection, the Exaltation, and the Second Advent in Jesus' view are three aspects of one idea.[3] When the parousia did not occur, the Early Church separated it from the Resurrection-Ascension, thus making two days of what Jesus had seen as one, and created the structure of early Christian eschatology along the lines of Jewish apocalyptic. Paul at first took over this Jewish eschatology (the Thessalonian Epistles) but later re-interpreted eschatology in terms of mysticism. The problem created by the delay of the parousia was solved by a re-apprehension of realized eschatology. This rediscovery John carried further by completely refining away the crude eschatological elements of a futurist eschatology; and thus it happens that the Gospel furthest removed from Jesus in time contains the nearest to a true statement of His teaching.[4] Dodd interprets the Johannine theology largely in terms of a platonic dualism.[5]

A different analysis has recently been proposed by Erich Dinkler, who traces two different concepts of time and eschatology in the New Testament, one derived from Jewish apocalyptic, the other from pre-Christian gnosticism. In the former, 'the parousia is expected as coming either immediately or remotely in the future and, correspondingly, the present time is conceived as a progress toward the cosmic conclusion of the drama, *i.e.*, the final act of the history of the world and salvation.' [6] This view is based on the apocalyptic teaching of the aeons, a structure which is not genuinely Christian.[7] The other view involves a 'contemporizing of eschatology' in the *kairos*, in the *krisis*, in the *pneuma hagion*, in the *zoe*, which is 'not referred to any decisive, final act of God in the future.' [8] The future will bring nothing new; the history of redemption is fulfilled. While, according to Dinkler, the impulses for this view were derived from pre-Christian gnostic sources, the contemporizing of eschatology is a genuine Christian conception. That which has

[1] C. H. Dodd, *The Present Task in New Testament Studies* [1936], 32 f.

[2] *Ib.*, 39 f.

[3] *The Parables of the Kingdom* [1936], 100 f. It is noteworthy in passing that this interpretation, which is the point of departure for his realized eschatology, is admitted to be 'no more than a speculative conjecture' about which 'there is nothing conclusive.'

[4] See *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* [1936]. It should be noted that Dodd has been criticized for a one-sided emphasis on realized eschatology (J. Jeremias *The Parables of Jesus* [1954], 18 f.), and that Dodd has apparently accepted the validity of this criticism (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [1953], 447); but it remains unclear, even in his book, *The Coming of Christ* [1951], to what extent Dodd would modify his position.

[5] *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.*

[6] Erich Dinkler, in *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Robert C. Dentan [1955], 205.

[7] *Ib.*, 206.

[8] *Ib.*, 205.

happened in Christ is believed to be the final chapter in God's drama of salvation. The new aeon is already here and the resurrection of the dead has already commenced.[1]

However, the tide is not flowing in one direction alone. Ethelbert Stauffer has recognized a greater measure of unity in the eschatological character of New Testament theology. He insists that we do not need to resort to Hellenistic religions to understand the New Testament. 'The New Testament writers are rooted, so far as their exegetical and theological thought forms go, in a living tradition which comes to them from the Old Testament via the apocryphal literature down to the apocalyptic national writings of their own time.'[2] Only in cases of need does Stauffer feel the demand to search for analogies in extra-Jewish sources, whether Roman astrology or gnostic speculations. The significance of this position will be seen when Stauffer describes John the Apostle, the author of the Fourth Gospel, as the Baptist's disciple and 'an apocalyptist cast in a levitical-liturgical mould, just as Gamaliel's disciple Paul is an apocalyptist cast in a rabbinic-dialectical mould.'[3] Stauffer finds a 'terse, consistent, unambiguous eschatology' in John's Gospel. Instead of detailed pictures of the future, the Evangelist announced the promise of the Spirit who will declare the things to come; and this promise is fulfilled in the Apocalypse—which Stauffer attributes also to the Apostle.

In spite, therefore, of such weighty names as Dodd and Dinkler, we may find some support from Stauffer's position to suggest the thesis that eschatology provides a basic unifying structure for New Testament theology. Specifically, (a) the apocalyptic structure of two aeons is basic for the theology of the Synoptics, of Paul, and also of John; (b) there is a contemporizing of eschatology in all three strata of New Testament theology; and (c) this contemporizing of eschatology in each case is to be understood as an anticipation, genuine though partial, of the future eschatological consummation. In other words, the main themes of New Testament theology are fundamentally eschatological in character, not platonic or gnostic.

In the Synoptic Gospels the Kingdom of God is essentially eschatological in its character, belonging to the age to come. It is true that the phraseology 'this age' and 'the age to come' is not of frequent occurrence in the Gospels. Indeed, Dalman thinks that if Jesus used these ideas at all, they were not of importance in His vocabulary.[4] Bultmann also dismisses them as secondary elements.[5] However, the importance of the concept is not to be determined by the frequency of occurrence of the words. That the idiom is deeply imbedded in the Gospel tradition is apparent from its distribution: Mark (4^{19} 10^{30}), M (Mt 13^{39-40} 28^{20}), L (Lk 16^{8}), Matthew (24^{3} 12^{32}), and Luke (20^{34-35}). It is found in every stratum of the tradition except Q. The discourse with the rich young ruler equates the Kingdom of God with the blessing of eternal life, both of which belong to the age to come (Mk $10^{17.\ 24.\ 30}$). Discipleship of Jesus in this age may entail sacrifice, loss, persecution; but in the age to come it will mean eternal life in the Kingdom of God. The Synoptic Gospels consistently place the consummation of the Kingdom of God in the age to come.

In contrast with Jewish apocalyptic, the unique element in Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom is the 'mystery of the kingdom': a Divine purpose, hitherto secret, now disclosed. Thus understood, the concept of mystery agrees with the other passages in the New Testament where it is found.[6] A mystery is not something incomprehensible or inaccessible to human knowledge. It is rather a new revelation of the Divine purpose, or as Otto Piper puts it, 'the secret of His purpose' which God had kept to Himself but has finally revealed to men.[7] This mystery, this Divine disclosure in the teaching and mission of Jesus, is not the general character of the Kingdom or the certain fact of its eschatological coming. The mystery is a *further* disclosure of God's purpose: the Kingdom which is to come finally in apocalyptic splendour has in fact entered the world in advance in a hidden form to work secretly among and within men.[8]

While the present age goes on, the Kingdom of God is dynamically active in the world although in an unseen manner. Instead of appearing with irresistible and glorious power, it is present in a

[1] *Ib.*, 209.

[2] *New Testament Theology* [1955], 20.

[3] *Ib.*, 42.

[4] G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* [1909], 148.

[5] R. Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* [1949], 242. See the literature cited in W. G. Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung*[2] [1953], 42 f.

[6] See especially Ro 16^{25}.

[7] Otto Piper, 'The Mystery of the Kingdom of God,' in *Interpretation*, i. [1947], 187.

[8] This interpretation is recognized by R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church* [1943], 62 ff.; C. E. B. Cranfield in *Scottish Journal of Theology* [1952], 49 ff.; Charles Masson, *Les Paraboles de Marc* iv. [1945], 21–3; J. Schniewind, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch I: Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 75 f.; Mundle in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*[2] [1930], iv. col. 1820; G. Bornkamm in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, iv, 823–5; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* [1954], 13.

humble form which may either be accepted or rejected by men even as seed either takes root or becomes unfruitful. Although the Kingdom of God has come among men, there is as yet no separation between the good and the evil. The judgment awaits the apocalyptic consummation when the Kingdom will come in power. Yet it is present; and though now as insignificant as a mustard seed, as unobtrusive as a bit of leaven in a bowl of dough, it is nevertheless of such superlative value that men should be willing to suffer any cost to acquire it. The central theme of Jesus' teaching has to do with an eschatological reality which has nevertheless entered unexpectedly into the world to work among men in a non-eschatological form. An eschatological reality is contemporized, but the eschatology remains.

While the element of realistic eschatology receives far less attention in the Fourth Gospel, it is nevertheless an essential factor. Furthermore, the basic structure is similar although the emphasis is different. The antithetical structure of the two ages appears even though the terminology is not found. 'He who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life' (Jn 12^{25}).

Two facts about this saying are to be noted. The word *aion* is displaced in favour of *kosmos*. This does not, however, prove that the antithetical structure has been abandoned. In fact, in a number of instances in Paul (cf. 1 Co 3^{19} 5^{10} 7^{31}, Eph 2^{2} with 1 Co 1^{20} 3^{18} 2^{6}) as well as in John, *kosmos* is used as a substitute for *aion*. The expression 'the ruler of this world' in Jn 12^{31} and 16^{11} is synonymous in meaning with 'the god of this age' in 2 Co 4^{4} and similar to 'the rulers of this age' in 1 Co 2^{6} and ^{8}.[1] We must conclude that 'this world' in Jn 12^{25} is quite synonymous with 'this age.'

Second, the saying in John is more apocalyptic in form than the parallel saying in the Synoptics.[2] 'The Fourth Evangelist alone has given it a form which obviously alludes to the Jewish antithesis of the two ages.'[3] Furthermore, eternal life in this verse belongs to the coming age. Eternal life, as in Mk $10^{17.\ 30}$, is an eschatological reality and belongs to the age to come. In John, this futuristic emphasis is found more than once. 'He who reaps receives wages, and gathers fruit for eternal life' (Jn 4^{36}). 'You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life' (Jn 5^{39}). There is a fountain of living water which springs up to eternal life (Jn 4^{14}) and a food which endures to eternal life (Jn 6^{27}). This eschatological life will be received only at the last day when the righteous will come forth to the resurrection of life (Jn 5^{29}).

However, eschatology is also contemporized. Jesus' mission in the world is to bring to men here and now the experience of the eternal life which properly belongs to the age to come. There is a distinct analogy between the concept of the Kingdom of God in the Synoptics and eternal life in John. Both belong to the age to come and are eschatological, yet both have by virtue of Jesus' mission become objects of present experience. As Mk 10^{17} and ^{25} equate eternal life with the future eschatological Kingdom, Jesus' discourse with Nicodemus equates the Kingdom of God with eternal life. 'Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God' (Jn 3^{5}); 'He who believes in the Son has eternal life; he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God rests on him' (Jn 3^{36}). Here we have the equation, 'kingdom of God'='eternal life.' So in the Synoptics, 'to inherit eternal life' and 'to enter into the Kingdom of God' seem to be interchangeable terms.[4]

A similar contemporizing of eschatology is found in the concept of the Resurrection. Realistic eschatology remains; the Resurrection at the last day is a recurrent theme.[5] This eschatological Resurrection is clearly announced in $5^{28.\ 29}$: 'The hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth . . . to the resurrection of life . . . to the resurrection of judgment.' Yet this eschatological Resurrection has also in some sense become an object of experience: 'The hour . . . now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live' (5^{25}). Resurrection, like eternal life, is eschatology; but it is also a matter of experience here and now.

Because of the strong emphasis in the Fourth Gospel upon the realized aspect of eschatology, many scholars have denied any trace of realistic eschatology on the ground that it is in direct contradiction with this strong accent upon experienced eschatology. Perhaps the most extreme illustration of this is Bultmann. He not only insists that these references to resurrection

[1] See H. Sasse in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, iii, 884 f. The reason for this phenomenon apparently is the fact that the Semitic had only one word, *olam*, which served for both concepts, 'age' and 'world'; and thus the two concepts are closely allied in Biblical thought and the words are sometimes interchangeable. See Sasse, *op. cit.*, 881; G. Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* [1952], 17–24.

[2] Cf. Mk 8^{35}, Mt 10^{39} 16^{25}, Lk 9^{24} 17^{33}.

[3] C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 146.

[4] W. F. Howard, *Christianity According to St. John* [1946], 112.

[5] $6^{39.\ 44.\ 54}$ 11^{24}; cf. also 12^{48}.

and the last day are redactorial insertions;[1] he goes to the consistent but radical extreme of interpreting the parousia saying in 1 Jn 2^{28} and 3^{2} to refer to the coming of Christ in the Holy Spirit.[2] There is nothing contradictory between the residual element of realistic eschatology and the major emphasis upon realized eschatology in the Fourth Gospel any more than the idea of the Kingdom of God as something both eschatological and present in the Synoptics is self-contradictory. In both we have a similar structure of realistic eschatological realities which have become objects of present experience. In the words of the recent commentator on the Fourth Gospel, C. K. Barrett, 'It is not true that John has abandoned the common New Testament eschatology.' Furthermore, 'the eschatological element in the fourth gospel is not accidental; it is fundamental.' But eschatology belongs no longer *only* to the future; 'the promise is already being fulfilled, but is being fulfilled in such a way as to leave over something of itself for a future fulfillment also.'[3]

This same basic structure is fundamental also to the structure of Paul's thought. There are two great foci in Paulinism: the objective and the subjective, justification and the life of the Spirit. Efforts to reconstruct Paul's thought around either one of these emphases as its centre—whether justification as theologians of the Reformation were inclined to do, or the life in Christ as contemporary students of Paul often do—and to minimize or ignore the other miss the Pauline balance. God is a righteous judge to whom man is responsible and with whom a right relationship must be established. Man is a sinner and must be made righteous by the impartation of the life of Christ in the Spirit. Both forensic and subjective righteousness accrue to the believer as redemptive benefits of the work of Christ. And both of these gifts, justification and the life of the Spirit, are eschatological realities belonging to the age to come which have nevertheless become objects of present experience in this evil age.

Justification is both forensic and eschatological. As forensic, it has to do not with a sinner's personal condition but with his relationship to the Ruler and Judge of the universe. In the Biblical view, ethics is always theologically grounded. Right is right and wrong is wrong because God is God; God is both Law-giver and Judge. If God judges a man to be in the right, he is righteous; but if God judges him to be in the wrong, he is unrighteous. By justification Paul has in mind not the infusion of a moral quality, the creation of a righteous life, but the absolution and acquittal of the wicked so that he is judicially absolved from the guilt of sin.[4] To speak of justification as involving a 'fiction' as Sanday[5] did, misses the fact that righteousness in the Biblical sense may mean either an ethical quality or a relationship. Bultmann has expressed it succinctly: 'When God justifies the sinner . . . that man is not merely "regarded as if" he were righteous, but really is righteous—*i.e.*, absolved from his sin by God's verdict.'[6]

Justification is the pronouncement of the Righteous Judge that the sinner is acquitted from all guilt of sin. As such, it is essentially eschatological; *i.e.*, it belongs to the eschatological day of judgment.[7] This is indicated in several passages in Paul. 'Who shall bring any charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies; who is to condemn?' (Ro 8^{33}). Here the sinner is seen standing in God's presence at the last judgment. The verdict has been passed; it is acquittal. Who then can controvert the Judge and bring a verdict of condemnation? When we read that it is not the hearers of the Law but the doers of the Law who will be justified (Ro 2^{13}), we are referred to the day of judgment. The hope of righteousness (Gal 5^{5}) is the hope of acquittal in the eschatological judgment. The eschatological character of justification is even more clear in a saying of Jesus: 'I tell you, on the day of judgment men will render account for every careless word they utter; for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned' (Mt $12^{36.\ 37}$). The opposite of justification is condemnation, an unfavourable decision of the Judge.

Thus far, the concept of justification differs little from the doctrine of the final judgment in contemporary Judaism. However, Paul asserts that by virtue of the death of Christ, men of faith have already been justified. 'They are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God

[1] Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* [1955], ii. 89. Bultmann has aptly been called 'our twentieth-century Marcion' because of his radical excision of alleged interpolations, The Expository Times, lxvii. [January, 1956], 98.

[2] *Ib.*, 85.

[3] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* [1955], 57, 58.

[4] Cf. G. Schrenk in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ii. 219. Cf. also pp. 192 ff., 207 f.; Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, chs. 7 and 8.

[5] W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* (*I.C.C.* [1906]), 36.

[6] R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* [1951], i. 276. I have replaced the translator's 'rightwises' with the less awkward 'justifies.'

[7] Cf. G. Schrenk, *op. cit.*, 209 f., 221 f. Morris does not adequately recognize the eschatological character of justification.

put forward as a propitiation [1] by his blood, to be received by faith' (Ro $3^{24f.}$). In the death of Christ, the eschatological judgment has already in essence taken place. The man of faith has in Christ appeared before the righteous Judge and by virtue of the death of Christ has been acquitted from all guilt of sin. The eschatological judgment, which belongs to the age to come, has reached back to the Cross of Christ, and the man of faith is living in the new age so far as his relationship to God is concerned. The last judgment for him is passed. This is not to say that Paul has relinquished the expectation of an eschatological judgment; even men of faith must appear before the judgment seat of Christ (2 Co 5^{10}, 1 Co 3^{13-15}). But so far as their relationship to God is concerned involving their *guilt* as sinners, judgment has been passed; they are absolved. 'There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus' (Ro 8^{1}). God has acquitted them; no one can condemn.

The second focus of Paul's thought is the new life, subjectively apprehended. Sometimes this is described in terms of the indwelling of Christ (Ro 8^{10}, Gal 2^{20}, Col 1^{27}), sometimes of the indwelling of the Spirit (Ro $8^{9ff.}$, 1 Co 3^{16}, Gal 4^{6}, 1 Th 4^{8}).[2] The man who has by faith been justified and has entered into a new relationship with God has also entered into a new experience of life. He who has been freed from condemnation has also been set free from the law of sin and death by the law of the Spirit of life (Ro 8^{1-2}). The Spirit is the source of a new life which frees one from the old bondage. When the Spirit of Christ, or Christ in the Spirit, indwells a man, his spirit is made alive even though his body continues to die (Ro 8^{9-10}); and eventually, even the mortal body will be animated with eternal life by that indwelling Spirit of life (Ro 8^{11}). Paul can go so far as to say that if 'any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come' (2 Co 5^{17}).

This new life, created by the indwelling of God's Spirit, is essentially the life of the age to come, for the Spirit Himself is an eschatological gift. Paul attests this fact by two metaphors. The indwelling Spirit is an *arrabon* and an *aparche*. The first term is a word used in the vernacular Greek in commercial transactions of the earnest-money, or down-payment given in advance of the full sum to be paid in full later.[3] The present gift of the Spirit brings a partial but real experience of the life of the age to come (2 Co 1^{22}). In the age to come, the acquisition of the full inheritance (Eph 1^{14}) will include the redemption of the body. Paul longs to put on the body not made with hands that what is mortal may be swallowed up in life (2 Co 5^{4}). Then he will receive a 'spiritual body' (1 Co 15^{44}), *i.e.*, a body transformed by the Spirit and thereby made imperishable, glorious and powerful, conformed to the body of Christ's glory (Ph 3^{21}). Then alone will the believer know the fullness of life. However, for this Paul must await the resurrection at the parousia of Christ and the age to come. Meanwhile, the Christian life is far more than hope; it involves more than a 'guarantee' of a future experience of life, as the Revised Standard Version translates it. Christian experience is the life of the Spirit which is an initial instalment of the fullness of the future life, the same in kind although limited in degree. 'Realized' eschatology does not displace realistic eschatology; rather, it is the reality of the life of the age to come which makes possible a partial experience of that life in the present age.

The same thought of eschatological experience is expressed by the word *aparche*. Properly speaking, this means a gift of first-fruits offered to God, but it is used by Paul of God's gift to man. The life of the Spirit does not exhaust the fullness of God's redemptive gifts, for we share the bondage to decay which afflicts all creation. God did not create men that they might suffer and succumb to corruption and death. We are waiting eagerly for the adoption, namely, the redemption of the body. This blessing belongs to the age to come. However, in spite of the fact that we are in this age in bondage to decay and death, we do have the Spirit as a first-fruits of the life of the age to come. First-fruits means more than the promise given by the sprouting of leaves or the bursting of blossoms; it is more than the expectation held forth by green but

[1] The writer feels that propitiation is a more accurate translation of *hilasterion* than expiation. The setting of the entire discussion in Ro 3 is the wrath of God against man's sin. In the death of Christ, God's wrath is satisfied-propitiated. See Leon Morris, in *New Testament Studies*, ii. [1955] 33–43; also *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, 125–185; Roger Nicole, 'C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation,' in *The Westminster Theological Journal*, xvii. [1955] 117–157.

[2] A similar intimacy of relationship between the glorified Christ and the Spirit is found in the Gospel of John where Christ promises to be present with His disciples in the person of the Spirit (Jn 14^{16-23}). The inference frequently made on the basis of 2 Co 3^{17}, that Paul actually identified the Spirit and Christ, is hardly justified in view of the distinction which Paul makes between Christ and the Spirit (Ro 8^{2}). See James S. Stewart, *A Man in Christ* [1935], 309 f.; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther* I–II (*HZNT*, [1949]), 200 and references there cited.

[3] J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* [1930], 79.

ndigestible fruit; first-fruits is the actual begin-ning of the harvest yet not identical with the harvest itself. Such is the life of the Spirit: the life of the age to come, the beginning of the eschatological harvest, yet not the fullness of that harvest. This life has through the Spirit been made available to human experience even in the midst of the decay and death of this evil age.

Whether we read the Synoptics, John or Paul, the same basic tune is sounded, although the key may be quite different and the harmony varied. The Kingdom of God, eternal life, justification and the life of the Spirit all belong to the age to come, all are eschatological. Yet all have become objects of present experience. Futuristic eschatology remains, but eschatology is also contemporized. Nowhere does the New Testament say that this age has passed away. The evil age remains; the basic antithetical structure is nowhere relinquished. Yet because of the death and resurrection of Christ, men may be delivered from the domination of the evil age (Gal 1^4). They need no longer be conformed to it (Ro 12^2), because, as the author of Hebrews puts it, they have experienced the power of the age to come (He 6^5). The redemptive blessings of the future age have, in part, reached back into this age before the full consummation of God's redemptive purpose.

This eschatological structure of New Testament theology points to two conclusions which can here only be mentioned. Instead of a single great day of redemption—the Day of the Lord—as the Old Testament sees it, the redemptive purpose is realized in two great acts which are *equally important* in the accomplishment of redemption. The Messianic mission is fulfilled in two stages; the Kingdom of God is to manifest itself in two forms; eternal life is to be experienced at two levels. In other words, we would suggest that instead of saying that the Christian structure modifies the Jewish time line by giving it a new centre—the Christ-deed,[1] the modification involves *two foci*. The work of Christ is a single work of redemption but accomplished in a two-fold mission, thus creating two crucial and equally essential points in the line of redemptive history. Apart from the future phase of Christ's work when He 'will appear a second time . . . to save those who are eagerly waiting for him' (He 9^{28}),[2] the redemptive mission of Christ remains incomplete.

Second, the conclusion emerges that according to this New Testament perspective, *the future has created the present*. From an ordinary point of view, we are inclined to say that the present determines and gives assurance of the future. Because of what Christ *has* done, we have assurance that the future is His also. This insight is not to be denied; it is profoundly true. But beside it may be placed another insight: the future has made possible the present. The Kingdom of God is eschatological; it belongs to the age to come, and only in that age will it achieve full consummation. But the future Kingdom has entered into the present to modify and influence its character. Eternal life, justification, the life of the Spirit, all are future and eschatological. The Biblical perspective is one of unbroken hope. However, these future blessings have, in part yet in reality, entered into the present. The future has in a sense become present without losing its character as futurity. This modified eschatological structure provides an approach to the basic unity of New Testament theology.

[1] Cf. O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time* [1950], 82 ff.

[2] The several references to Hebrews should not be construed to suggest a belief in Paul's authorship. The same basic structure outlined in this paper appears also in Hebrews. See C. K. Barrett, 'The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews,' in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube [1956], 363–393.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

A Bit of Stamp History

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'I will give unto this last, even as unto thee.'—Mt 20^{14}.

It costs twopence to send The Expository Times by post now, I see. And a parcel of books costs the earth. Up and up they go, postal charges like everything else.

But I'm forgetting. Years ago in the fourteenth century you had to hire a private messenger if you wanted to send a letter from one place to another, and that made letter-writing a pretty expensive luxury. Bit by bit, the country was covered with a system of routes. There were postboys who really 'posted' (ran) along the roads, carrying wallets in which, for a certain fee, they would transport letters. But it was awkward if they didn't go where you wanted to send. Then stage coaches began, and letters were entrusted

to the guard. That made him and his mail coach very important—and well worth the highwayman's trouble to rob.

You can learn a lot about the history of the post in a museum in Tottenham, just outside London. There is a receipt dated 1397 from a private messenger who carried letters for a viscount; maps of post routes in the sixteenth century; engravings and models of postboys and stage coaches, and the pistols and horns they carried. We can even see a mail coach passing a gallows where a man hangs because he has robbed the mail! There is a surveyor's wheel which was pushed along the roads in the eighteenth century to determine how far the letters were carried and therefore how much they should be charged; for everyone thought it quite right that letters going a long way should be charged more than those going to a neighbouring town.

Unusual? Yes, it is. The museum used to be a school called Bruce Castle run by a family of unusual people. One of the schoolmasters became an M.P. Then he made the astounding suggestion that letters should all be charged the same, no matter whether they were going five miles or five hundred. What is more, he was going to make the post so cheap that he believed millions more letters would be carried. We have forgotten that Sir Rowland Hill was a schoolmaster, but because he invented the Penny Post his school has become a treasure house of relics of the Post Office.

At first it seemed ridiculous that long distance letters should be as cheap as local ones, and it is hardly fair that they should be. But we simply could not go back to the old business of paying by the mile. They sneered at Hill, but we have come to see that he was right.

They sneered at Jesus too, because He would not side with the Pharisees who thought they knew just when a sin was punishable by stoning. But we are coming, little by little, to see how right He was when He reminded us that, even when we have done our duty, we are no more than unprofitable servants in the sight of God.

So Jesus told a parable about men who worked for different lengths of time in a vineyard but all received a full day's wage. Of course, those who had worked longest grumbled. But in God's service we all get far, far more than we deserve. I can imagine that I might have to halve my son's pocket money if I felt that one week he had not deserved it. But we can never imagine God halving His love towards us—and we have never deserved that at all. He goes on giving it to us in spite of what we are. And to all of us—'He causes His sun to rise upon the evil and the good.' He is really Father.

I Huff You!

By the Reverend Canon T. E. Edmond, M.A., Little Heath Vicarage

'Love is never touchy.'—1 Co 13[5] (J. B. Phillips' translation).

The Battle of the Huff is on. It has apparently been going on for some time. The controversy is over the Huffing rule. For over two hundred years a draughts player has had the right to remove his opponent's piece, if it didn't jump, when it could have done. The player merely blew on the offending piece and said, 'I huff you.'

It all came to a head at a conference of draughts players. It appears that some players take advantage of the rule and some do not. One member of the conference said that he regarded the huff as 'a kid's game.' Another said he didn't see 'an atom of skill in the rule and had never huffed in his life.' Another member pleaded for the abandonment of the rule on the ground that 'the word had come to stand for arrogance, pride and bad temper'!

So 'to take the huff' has come to mean 'to take offence quickly.' The dictionary states that 'to huff' means 'to puff, to blow, to bluster, and to swell with anger.' Some people do take offence at the smallest thing; they misunderstand something and go off, we say, 'in a huff.' They play a game and when they lose begin to argue about it and get 'huffy.' So, whatever the draughts players' conference may have decided, for the Christian boy and girl the Battle of the Huff is always on. Whenever they fight against pride and temper the Battle of the Huff is being fought.

I asked a lad the other day how he was getting on in his new job. 'Not too badly,' he said, 'but you've got to keep away from the manager, he's so touchy!'

'Love,' said St. Paul, 'is never touchy.' A Christian doesn't go about noting down in an account book all the wrongs that have been done him. 'Love is not easily provoked.'

The Christian Year

Second Sunday after Trinity

Without Christ

By the Reverend James Martin, B.D., Glasgow

'They all with one consent began to make excuse.' —Lk 14[18].

These men had already intimated their desire to be present at the banquet that was being arranged. Now that the time was come and the

summons was delivered, they pleaded that they were unable, after all, to attend. The obvious truth, however, was, not that they were unable, but that they were unwilling—unwilling to pay the price. The clear implication of Jesus' story is that there will always be those ready to profess sympathy and interest concerning the challenge He presents but who, when the call comes to them, will refuse to answer it on the grounds of its cost.

The Rich Young Ruler was one of this sort. It seemed to him that he could not afford to pitch in his life with Jesus in the thoroughgoing fashion that the Master was demanding, and so he withheld his allegiance. He has his numerous counterparts in our own day. They would like to be Christians but find it impossible. They cannot afford to follow Jesus in the thoroughgoing fashion that He seems to demand. That, at any rate, is their plea. But it is with them as it was with the men in Jesus' parable. They cry, 'I can not' but what they really mean is, 'I will not.'

In every walk of life men are regularly to be found pleading 'I can't do that' when their real meaning is 'I am not prepared to make the necessary sacrifice'—and this not least concerning the things of religion and of the Church. A mother protests that she cannot find time to teach her child to pray; and yet somehow finds time to sit with him through Children's Television. A man declares that he cannot afford to add one penny more to his church offering; and yet what he gives is but a fraction of what he spends on his personal indulgences. Another man refuses the invitation to teach a Sunday School class on the score of being unable to spare the time for preparation; and yet, week in, week out, he never fails to make room for his morning's golf, his afternoon's football and his evening's film. Another cannot manage more than a very infrequent visit to worship because he has such a busy week that he must rest at the week-ends; and yet there are few summer Sundays that do not find him driving to the coast. So we might continue. For many people and in respect to many things, 'I can not' is no more than an equivalent for 'I will not.'

This, at any rate, is often so with the challenge to take Christ seriously. Men say that they cannot afford it but their argument is always false. This could be amply demonstrated by an examination of the validity of the excuses offered—as in the parable, so in real life. It may, however, be more strikingly demonstrated by pointing out that in the most pertinent sense there is no one who can afford *not* to be a Christian. For who can afford to be without Christ as personal friend and Saviour in the warfare of life?

Who, for instance, can afford to be without Christ in the hour of temptation? Here, say, is a man beset by some strong temptation. If he is not linked to Christ by the bonds of personal faith, how is he likely to win through? Augustine was many times confronted with the challenge to close with Christ but just as often he fended it off. He could not afford to be a Christian, could not afford to be without his woman and his wantonness. But in the end he came to recognise that he could not afford to be without Christ. The sins he was clinging to so fiercely were despoiling his life and character, and only through Christ could deliverance come.

Or who can afford to be without Christ in the hour of deep sorrow? Few men have had to tread a more agony-strewn path of personal sorrow than had Adoniram Judson and sorrow's night reached its blackest pitch when he had to lay to rest his wife and family in foreign soil. Wonderfully, the Saviour in whom he had put his trust brought him out of that night into a new day. But how, lacking Christ, is a man ever to find his way out of sorrow's darkness into light?

Or who can afford to be without Christ in the hour of bleak loneliness? The annals of the human race contain no lonelier picture than that of David Livingstone out in the bowels of unknown Africa, for months and years at a stretch with no white man for company. But Livingstone was never alone. His Lord had promised, 'Lo, I am with you alway,' and in this promise Livingstone had implicit trust, as being the word of a gentleman of the highest honour. And his experience had proved it true. But how does it fare in the lonely reaches with the man who has not Christ?

Or who can afford to be without Christ in the hour of personal suffering? A writer describes an old lady's face as being 'full of suffering and full also of the overcoming of it.' The book tells also that she was a person of deep faith in Christ, but we could have guessed that even if it had not been stated. How else was her face likely to tell the story that it did? When a person is not bound fast to Christ, his face may well be full of suffering but it will not often be full of the overcoming of it.

Or who can afford to be without Christ in the hour of death? Tubby Clayton tells of a young sergeant in the First World War who was writing home on the eve of going into battle at Paschendaele. He finished his letter: 'Good-night! Don't mind, whatever happens. It's all right. I am upheld.' He fell in the action, but it was 'all right,' as he had said, since he was with Christ and Christ with him. It is 'all right,' too, with every man whose life and soul are delivered into Jesus' keeping. But what of the man who has

not Christ in the hour of death's approach? It is reported that when O. Henry drew near his end, he beckoned his nurse to the bedside and whispered, 'Nurse, bring me a candle.' 'A candle?' she exclaimed, 'Why do you want a candle?' 'Because,' he said, 'I am afraid to go home in the dark.' Who can afford, in the hour of life's departure, to be standing apart from Christ?

'Christianity is all very well,' one hears men say. 'It's a good thing for those who can afford it. Personally, I can not.' Jesus' parable of the excuse-makers would say to all such pleaders, 'Can you really afford *not* to be wholly His?'

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

When the Bells Ring

BY THE REVEREND J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D., LONDON

'Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.'—Lk 15^{10}.

If that is true, then of all the things ever said it is the most glorious; if it is not true, then it is the most absurd.

On the face of it, it would appear absurd to claim that heaven is interested at all in anything that goes on down here on earth. When we realise how tiny this earth is and how vast the universe, it is indeed very questionable whether God and His angels are concerned with this little planet. We have come to feel acutely to-day our relative position in the universe. 'Are we not told, as a very elementary fact, that light, travelling at the rate of some eleven million miles a minute, takes three and a half years, less or more, to reach us from the very nearest of the stars, the closest of our neighbours, and that the mass of them are vastly farther off than that, constellations heaped on constellations, and universe on universe, it seems? And somewhere in these immeasurable wastes there spins an earth, to us central and huge, but really a tiny atom of a thing, so unimportant that, did it fall out of the sky, it would be missed no more than one leaf fluttering earthwards in an interminable forest clothed in its midsummer glory.'

No one but the late A. J. Gossip could put it quite like that. But we have all been made to feel it in our own way. 'There is joy among the angels of God' over something that goes on down here? It surely cannot be!

And yet, in spite of the appalling vastness of the universe in which this earth of ours is set, some of the scientists seem to suggest that conditions on the earth make it appear that it has somehow been chosen out of myriads of worlds for a particular purpose.

Let us not misunderstand this. It is not a case of our religious faith being based on the remarks of a few scientists. But we do need to realise what science is actually saying as opposed to what some in a vague way think science is saying. What the evidence seems to point to is not that the universe is so vast that we cannot attach any importance to this earth at all so far as the Creator Spirit is concerned, but that despite the fact that the universe is so unimaginably great, yet, conditions of life upon the earth are such as to suggest that it is at least one of those planets which have been specially picked out.

'There is joy among the angels' over something that happens down here? It may not be so absurd after all.

Now, if Jesus had claimed that in a general way heaven is interested in the earth, in its great movements and final destiny, it might have been credible. But He was not content to do that. 'There is joy in heaven over *one*. . . .' Something that happens here on earth to one man is of great concern to God and His hosts?

This is rather much. We have been thinking of the significance of the earth in the universe. Think now of the insignificance of one man in relation to the earth and the whole of humanity. And let A. J. Gossip thunder again. 'Here we are, turned out by the million, lost in the crowd of creation, indistinguishable from our fellows at a very little distance, putting through the trivial nothings that make our lives, really tiny insects crawling about the bottom of this little pool of air, a handful of miles high, no more, in which we can live. A moment, and we are gone, swallowed up, we too, by that oblivion which has engulfed such multitudes whose lives were every bit as interesting and important to them as ours are now to us. A few years at the most, and the moss-grown lettering on our tombstones will have grown indecipherable; and, wonderfully quickly, our name will have sunk into a soundless sound, conveying nothing to a single mind.'

'There is joy in heaven over one . . .'? Is it really possible? Is it conceivable that God should be concerned over me? Jesus said, 'There is joy in heaven over one. . . .' Not once, not twice did He say it. The sparrow does not fall to the ground without God, He claimed. A shepherd having a hundred sheep, if one of them be lost, will not rest till he find it. And God, said Jesus, is like that.

What is the reason for this claim to importance of the individual man or woman? It is that we have been made in the image of God. The universe is great; even this world is great, but I can

contain it in my mind and therefore am greater than it. There is Pascal's celebrated word about the mountain rising up and crushing him; he would still be greater than the mountain because he would know he was being crushed while the mountain would not. The cynic may say that that is cold comfort to the man under the mountain. But it is still a great word. Man is not puny. He is mind and spirit, made in the image of his Creator God.

Joy in heaven over one man? Not so absurd, perhaps.

But the whole thing seems to be spoiled again. If Jesus had left it at that and had us believe that heaven is concerned about one man who bears the image of God, we might even have found ourselves able to accept it. We would have conjured up in our minds pictures of those in whom that Divine image shone forth in unparalleled splendour—names like Stephen and John the Beloved, Bonaventura and St. Francis, Mary Slessor and David Livingstone, Aggrey and Sadhu Sundar Singh and Albert Schweitzer. When we see their great faith we can well imagine heaven itself being concerned. But no. 'There is joy in heaven over one sinner. . . .' Not one in whom the Divine image is unmistakable, but one in whom the Divine image is almost blotted out. Not one whose face is constantly toward God, but one whose face is away from God. Not one who has succeeded, but one who has failed. And in all His ministry Jesus seemed to emphasise this fact. He earned for Himself the scornful name of friend of publicans and sinners. He defied the world by showing that heaven is concerned over something that happens to a sinner.

Well, that 'something' which stirs heaven must be quite cataclysmic. It must mean that the sinner of whom we spoke has suddenly become a saint; it must mean that the grace of God has so worked as to bring back into shining glory the Divine image which had been almost wiped out? Surely nothing less than that could set the bells of heaven ringing?

No. 'There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' Not one who reaches the portals of heaven and makes the angels whisper, 'How like Christ he is!' but one whose face slowly turns in a new direction; not one who has reached the goal, but one who sets his feet on the road; not one who has reached the Father's home and upon whose neck the Father has fallen, but one who in the far country comes to himself and mutters, 'I will arise and go.' That is all.

There must have been plenty of bad news carried to heaven lately, plenty to make heavy the heart of God, from this strife-ridden world whose madness seems to grow rather than to abate. There is something that can relieve the grief of God, says Jesus. And we are all qualified to do it. Some of us are rich, some poor; some happy, some sad; but we are all sinners. We are of that number that can set heaven ringing. We can do it if we will change our mind about God and ourselves. That act, simple in itself, tremendous in its possibilities, can give joy to the angels of God.

An incredible story? We might indeed think so if we did not recall the lips from which it first came.

Fourth Sunday after Trinity

Strength for the Day

By Principal C. Leslie Mitton, Ph.D.,
Handsworth College, Birmingham

'As thy days, so shall thy strength be.'—Dt 33^{25}.

At one period in my ministry I used to visit an old lady who had come to live with her married daughter. At first I was able to chat with her by the kitchen fire, but the time came when she was too feeble to go downstairs and I had to sit at her bedside. The first time I went into the bedroom I noticed on the wall over the bed, printed in large letters and handsomely framed, the words of this text. After our conversation we prayed together and the words of the text wove themselves into the prayer. As I rose to say farewell, her face was shining with happiness, and she said, 'I see you've noticed my text.' She told me the story of it. When she was a girl in her early teens she and some friends attended a village chapel. The Sunday School superintendent, an old and saintly man, took special interest in them, in order to win them for Jesus Christ and His Church. At last the time came for them to be received into the fellowship of the Church, and after the service, to mark the occasion, the old man gave to each of them a large, printed text. The old lady in the bed could still remember, though it was seventy years back, how he said, as he handed this one to her: 'This is going to be *your* text, all through your life.' And she added: 'It has never let me down.'

Dr. James Reid tells in one of his books of his first days as a young student at Edinburgh University, and of the Inaugural Meeting which marked the beginning of the College year. Among the hundreds of students present, many were like himself, having left home for the first time, nervous and a little frightened, eager to enjoy their new freedom, but wondering if they would be able to measure up to the demands of this

new life and avail themselves of the opportunities which would not come back, if they were wasted. He remembers the words commended to them for their good on that occasion by George Adam Smith : ' As thy days, so shall thy strength be ' ; and also the paraphrase he used to press home their meaning : ' The strain will bring the strength.'

Here, then, is God's promise, a promise for young people as they set out into life, and for older people who draw towards its end, and, indeed, for all who humbly seek to take the way God appoints for them, and to look to Him for the strength they need.

There are some people who think that, if they try to do God's will, God should set them free from all troubles and hardships. It is true that, if we do live in obedience to God's commands, we are spared many ills and unhappinesses which follow upon wrong-doing. But there is no promise that we shall escape all pain and disaster. Christ Himself, the sinless One, died on a cross. So we should not expect complete exemption from trouble. We are subject to the sorrows and heartaches which are part and parcel of our human life on earth. But though we are not promised exemption from it, we are promised that if trouble comes, with it will be given the strength we need for meeting it. The heavier the burden, the greater will be our resources.

Some may ask : Is not this too good to be true ? Can you really mean that if the difficulties of life increase, our power to cope with them will be proportionately increased ? Yes, that is the promise, and it is a promise constantly being proved true in the experience of Christians everywhere. Often it happens, as you visit a home where there is heavy trouble, and week after week admire the patience, courage and endurance of some one in that home who is shouldering a very heavy burden, when at last the trouble is passing and the light shining again in the darkness, he or she will turn to you and say, as if surprised at the discovery, ' Isn't it wonderful how strength is given to you when you need it ? ' It is wonderful, but it is a plain fact of Christian experience. In the picturesque words of Scripture : God gives His angels charge over us, to bear us up.

Such, then, is God's promise. Its relevance is obvious for anyone who is confronted by trouble and distress, and who does not know how he is going to come through it.

It is also a promise, as we have seen, for young people on the threshold of some new venture which life is unfolding before them. Perhaps they have become aware of the claim that Jesus Christ is making upon them. They say, ' I know I ought to give Him my life, and live true to Him. But what is the good ? I couldn't keep it up.' They look at what it is going to mean, being a Christian, not only in their own private lives, but in the workshop, on the football field, and in their homes. Then they look at their own faltering hearts and wills and see only too clearly that their own resources are not sufficient for this new undertaking. But you see the mistake they are making. They compare the new task with the old reserves of strength. But this is a serious error. When we step out into God's way at His command, we do not travel in our own strength, but in the strength which He supplies. When He commands, He also provides. If we take His way, He gives strength for the journey. As our days, so shall our strength be.

This promise, however, is not just for those in trouble and those facing life's new commitments ; it is for every one of us. All of us know what it feels like to be overfaced with difficulties that beset us, or apprehensive about the dreadful possibilities that may await us in the unknown future. Worry and fear harass our human minds persistently. Nor can we find a cure by arguing that the dreaded things will not happen. Probably they won't, but they *may*. How can our trembling hearts find peace ? Not in the uncertain hope that we may escape trouble, but rather in this sure promise, that if distress should be our lot, then all the faithfulness and resourcefulness of God is at our disposal. In this promise, we may find peace even in the midst of strife. For peace is not the absence of strife and strain, but the conscious possession of adequate resources. These resources are in God, and our faith in His promise is that which can tap those resources.

When the Apostle Paul found himself face to face with a prolonged ordeal he utterly dreaded, he received from the living Christ this assurance : ' My grace is sufficient for thee,' which is the New Testament version of our Old Testament promise.

It is a memorable experience to find this promise coming true in our time of need. Some, looking back at such a time, would even say : It was worth having the strain in order to find the strength. Anguish and heartbreak have not been in vain if in them we have learned to be utterly sure that in our need God's hand is there to uplift, and the living Christ present to guide, comfort and save.

Indeed, may it not be true that our heavenly Father allows the strains and stresses of life sometimes to overtake us for this very purpose, to open our eyes to the spiritual resources which are ever available to us in Jesus Christ.

Here, then, is a promise to make our own, to build our life on, to find our peace in. We can trust it, because it is God's promise, offered to us

in His written Word. Moreover, it is a promise which is vouched for in the experience of His people. So it is a promise made doubly sure to us. It is a dependable promise for all who in simple trust and obedience commit their lives to God in Christ, and claim this promise as their own.

The strain will bring the strength.
As thy days, so shall thy strength be.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Taking Courage

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A., EDINBURGH

'He thanked God, and took courage.'—Ac 28^{15}.

What a strange and searching experience it is when some dream long cherished comes true in such a way that the reality mocks the vision! Paul as a boy must often have dreamed that one day he would go to Rome—he would become a great soldier and ride in triumph into the Eternal City, as part of a pageant of prisoners and trophies from the lands he had conquered, or he would be given the gift of oratory, he would be invited to Rome, he would stand where Cicero stood, on the rostrum in the Forum, holding the crowd spell-bound by his eloquence. Then he became a Christian, his one burning desire to proclaim Christ—first in the wilds of Asia Minor, then in Athens, Corinth, Jerusalem he declared the unsearchable riches of his Lord, but always he dreamed of Rome and preaching there, perhaps from that same rostrum in the Forum. Now he has landed at Puteoli, and is actually on his way to Rome, but he is one of a band of prisoners under escort, kindly treated, but still a prisoner. Ahead of him is prison, trial, probably death. How the reality must have mocked the vision! At that moment he was met by a band of Christians come out from Rome to greet him, and convoy him into the city, and we read 'He thanked God, and took courage.'

How often life brings us into a situation like that in which we need more than anything else to find encouragement. Reading between the lines it seems as if Paul had been losing heart a little, becoming downcast and depressed. Such depression may have been largely physical. He had been in and out of prison for two years; he had undergone the long-continued strain of the fourteen days and nights on that drifting derelict, and although he had enjoyed three months of kindly treatment in Malta he had been busy all the time, with healing virtue going out of him. Why this little detail that they stayed seven days at Puteoli? Was it because Paul was a sick man, suffering from one of his recurring bouts of prostrating illness, malaria, epilepsy, or whatever his 'thorn in the flesh' really was? Perhaps it was just weariness, his strength sapped by too many demands over too long a period. Certain it is that often with ourselves when things look black, when we feel disappointed and defeated, when our doubts are more real than our convictions, the cause for similar reasons is largely physical, and to remember that may be strangely reassuring. Or perhaps Paul's weariness was mental. He was seeing the contrast between the dream and the reality, the chains where there should have been freedom for the gospel. His mind was trying to wrestle with the problems that lay ahead, and feeling unequal to it. Most likely the cause was mainly spiritual. He had been giving out too long, drawing too continuously on his resources of courage, control, faith, hope and love, and the strain was telling, reaction was setting in. How often that situation is fundamentally our own—the constant daily demands into which you must put something of your very self, the long-continued handling of a situation that calls for patience, loyalty, self-control, self-sacrifice, a period of long illness for oneself or some loved one, a time of bereavement with the initial shock and the slow realisation. What a comfort to realise that Paul, whom we picture as always equal to anything, confident, competent, his life a continual pageant of triumph, knew such a mood. And what of Christ Himself? He, too, knew pain and weariness, the darkening of the mind, exhaustion of spirit. At this point, too, He is able to succour them that are sorely tried, who need, above all else, encouragement.

Encouragement begins when a man learns to see and emphasise the encouraging elements in a situation, and to thank God for them. To Paul, trudging along the Appian Way, weary in step and at heart, came this group of Christian folk out to meet him, and when he saw them he started counting the encouragements. He has friends; the weight lifts, the spring comes back into his step, as they turn and march with him. He has ten miles to realise that he has been becoming wrapped up in himself, and most unfair to Luke, who has been all along with him, one of the encouragements that are always there. He begins to realise that these Christian folk have come out from Rome to meet him, and that means that God is already at work in the situation he had been afraid to face, God's positive purpose is still before him. All God's power is still his—in the midst of all his weakness, prisoner though he be, he still has a part in God's purpose. The word used for 'came to meet' is most significant; it is the word that would be used for going to

welcome a conquering hero, or to offer the keys of the city to a king. This welcome gives back a sense of his worth to a tired sick man and proves the best possible tonic. Then he comes to Three Taverns, thirty-three miles from Rome and here are more friends, more encouragements! This incident has no message for the happy and prosperous, who have nothing to worry them, but it does speak to those with a difficulty, a dilemma that literally gets them down, a situation which has them defeated, a situation they are afraid to face. To them it says: 'Demand a recount of your resources. Dare to challenge your own estimate of the situation. Look for the encouragements that will come to meet you.'

Encouragement comes not through abstract ideas but by personal influence. These Christians did not argue Paul out of his depression, weariness and doubt, they lifted him out of it. When he saw them, it was enough. It was like the sun coming out, and Giant Despair, as Bunyan reminds us, is always subject to fainting fits on sunshine days. Their trust called forth a new determination not to fail them; their belief in him made him believe again in himself. It must always be so, and what a great task it is, to keep men on their feet, to help them to go on when they are ready to give in. Such is the task of every Christian. John Buchan said that his old grandmother had one great principle: 'Never daunton youth.' What a slogan for these difficult days: 'Never daunton, always encourage.' It may take so little. There is a memorable scene in the film of the life of Pierre and Marie Curie. They had completed their months of superhuman toil in seeking to produce the first radium, and they came back after dark to the old shed which was all the laboratory they could get. As they came near they saw a strange glow that told them they had not failed or toiled in vain. How little it takes, some word of appreciation, some tiny revelation of what is in one's heart, to kindle that glow that says: 'I have not failed, or toiled in vain.' Courage is a candle we kindle best at someone else's flame, and where better than at the flame of One who has done more than anyone else to encourage tired, baffled, defeated humanity, One who went down Himself into the depths of utter weakness of body, darkness of mind and despair of spirit? In the utter darkness of the Cross He heard a voice saying: 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom'—He saw the glow, the glimmer of response that told Him His whole life's fight was not fought in vain. The tortured head was lifted, the breaking heart was lightened. He thanked God, and took courage.

The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel—

Continued

By the Reverend E. M. Sidebottom, B.A., M.Litt., West Hartlepool

Wherever one turns the background against which the Johannine Son of Man moves shows him up as a human figure rather than a supernatural symbol. With his inheritance from Ezekiel and the evangelical tradition he is historical; he is also 'ideal' in some sense from his connexion with the Servant of the Lord, with Wisdom, and possibly with the apocalyptic manlike one and Adam. Both sides of his character are brought out in the Gospel.

Messiah. There is more to be said for the view that John was written for Jewish readers than is generally allowed. He constantly uses the word 'Jews' in a quite arbitrary sense to denote those in opposition to the Christian message, and sometimes actually as distinct from others who are also in fact of Jewish race. 'Salvation,' he declares, 'is of the Jews' (4^{22}). Rabbinic scholars have often pointed out the rabbinic turns of phrase and methods of argument in his work. He also brings out the political situation more clearly than the other New Testament writers.[1] Dodd acknowledges that 'the Fourth Evangelist even more definitely than the Synoptics, is developing his doctrine of the person and work of Jesus with conscious reference to Jewish messianic belief' (*The Fourth Gospel*, 90), and 'no other New Testament writer shows himself so fully aware of the Jewish ideas associated with the title "Messiah" as does the Fourth Evangelist' (*The Fourth Gospel*, 228). In fact, John alone in the New Testament uses the transliteration *Messias* (1^{41}) and he declares his very aim to be 'that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God' (20^{31}). Moses wrote of Him, Isaiah saw His glory, He is the 'holy one of God.' Believing in His name, believing that He is the Christ, and receiving the light or the word are practically the same thing (cf. 1^{12} with 1 Jn 5^{1}). As elsewhere, Jesus is the fulfilment of Zech $9^{9.\ 10}$ (Jn 12^{13-15}; cf. Mt 21^{5}).

Yet He is more prophet than king (see Dodd,

[1] Jn 6^{15} 7^{26} 10^{24} 11^{49-53} 18^{36} $19^{12.\ 15}$, for example.

The Fourth Gospel, 255) : Pilate, He asks, ' Do you mean king in the traditional sense, or have you divined My secret ? I came into the world to bear witness to the truth. Every one who is of the truth hears My voice ' ($18^{34.\ 37}$). The people recognize Him as prophet, having seen the meaning of His signs ' (6^{14} 7^{40}). John the Baptist denies that he is ' the Prophet ' and points instead to the Lamb of God, who is to take away the sins of the world, the whole world, for Truth is universal ($1^{21.\ 29}$; cf. 1 Jn 2^{2}). He confesses Himself Christ to the Samaritan woman (4^{26}), but the Samaritans recognize Him as the Saviour of the world (4^{42}).[1] When they seek to compel Him to be king of a nationalist movement He withdraws into the hills by Himself (6^{15}). Westcott comments : ' So he drove many from him (6^{60}), while he called out a completer confession of faith from the twelve (6^{69}). Words which had been used before (ch. 1), have now a wholly different meaning. To believe in Christ now was to accept with utter faith the necessity of complete self-surrender to him who had finally rejected the homage of force ' (*The Gospel according to St. John*, lxx.). So when Nathanael hails Him as Son of God, King of Israel, Jesus exchanges these titles for ' Son of Man ' which, here as in Mark, He prefers to the narrow Jewish messianic names (cf. Mk 8^{29} with ^{31}). It seems in Jn 12^{34}[2] that the crowd are represented as identifying the Christ with the Son of Man of whom Jesus speaks, and are confused because their idea of the Messiah was of one who abides for ever, *i.e.*, an invincible conqueror.[3] In fact, the Johannine Christ surpasses all popular expectation : He is not the apocalyptic Christ either (7^{27}), but a mere man who does signs no greater than those of Moses ($6^{30.\ 31}$).[4] But the officers sent to arrest Him declare that no man ever spoke like this man ! (7^{46}). Yet it is in His full acceptance of manhood and community with all men in their manhood that the salvation of men and the universality of salvation consists : the inscription on the Cross is in the three languages of the world—Hebrew and Latin and Greek (19^{20}).[5] It is at the true Image of God that men look and are saved as they contemplate the lifted-up Son of Man. John leads his readers to a new conception of Messiah as Son of Man, prophet and witness to Truth, and therefore universal in His significance as in His manhood.

Judgment and Manhood. As we have seen, the Son of Man in Ezekiel is commanded to judge (Ezk 20^{4}, etc.). In John Jesus is charged with making Himself equal with God because He claims to judge and dispense life ($5^{26.\ 27}$)—both Divine prerogatives according to rabbinic ideas (see Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, on 5^{17} ; Schlatter on 5^{21}). This trait in John is usually traced to the apocalyptic manlike being who comes in judgment and to rule—for the function of the king for the Hebrew is chiefly judgment. Charles confidently asserted that Jn 5^{27} went back to Enoch,[6] but Dn 12^{3} is much more likely if we are to fasten on any text at all (so Torrey, for example). And the curious omission of the article (' authority to execute judgment because he is son of man ') suggests Dn 7^{13} where the omission of the article in the Greek ' represents the original exactly ' (Westcott, *ib.*, 34). Here the manlike one ' symbolized the rightful authority which was to be established ' (*ib.*) as against that symbolized by the beasts because to Adam dominion was given originally.[7] The idea is brought out in Paul and

[1] Bultmann points out that ' Saviour of the World ' is a specifically Hellenistic term (*New Testament Studies*, i. 2) ; but the explanation of its absence in Judaism may lie in the fact that though Odeberg can find reference in the rabbis to the ' Johannine ' double sense of the ' world ' he can find no reference there to God *loving* the world.

[2] Bernard, *ib.*, 443, held that ' Son of man ' in Jn 12^{34} was not a title for Christ in the ears of the crowd. ' Who is *this* Son of Man ? ' however only distinguishes one sort of Messiah from another.

[3] Lowther-Clark wrote in 1936 that ' The usual distinction, common in sermons even if it has disappeared from the books of scholars, between the Son of Man who came to serve and to suffer and the Conquering King of Jewish expectation, does not hold good ' (*Divine Humanity*, 15). This is by no means as certain as this writer makes it sound ; but, in any case, ' it must be remembered that the bulk of the hearers of Jesus were simple people. It is extremely unlikely that they possessed all the texts in Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (or even all that were in existence at the time) ; and it is certain that they did *not* have Charles' commentaries. Consequently the views of the average man may well have been less refined than those of twentieth-century experts on the subject ' (Manson, *Servant-Messiah*, 24 *n.*). This would apply to John's crowd.

[4] For similar conclusions see R. A. Edwards, *The Fourth Gospel*, 61, 62, etc.

[5] Edwards, *ib.*, 153, denies the symbolism, but why then did John remark the circumstance ? The Gospels are by no means camera snaps.

[6] En 69^{27}. The words are : And he sat on the throne of his glory. And the sum of judgment was given to that son of man. They do not closely resemble John !

[7] Thornton (*The Dominion of Christ*, 172, *n.* 1) on Jn $5^{25\text{-}29}$ says : ' In this last statement Daniel's judgment scene is on the Genesis background. The Son of Adam (who, like the first Adam, has " Zoe in himself ") exercises the functions of his restored dominion, " calling " the dead into the new order of risen life as Adam " called " the animals into their proper cosmos.' Daniel does not, in fact, speak of the Son of Adam ; but the exegesis ' in him was life ' refers to Adam because Eve (=Life) was one of his ribs seems fanciful.

more clearly in Hebrews by the use made of Ps 8 and the language about putting everything under the feet of man.[1] In Wis 9[2] after the statement that God 'made all things by his word and man by his wisdom' the writer goes on:

> That he should have dominion over the creatures that were made by thee,
> And rule the world in holiness and righteousness,
> And execute judgement in uprightness of soul.

St. Paul uses these words 'righteousness' and 'uprightness' when speaking of the 'New Man' (the words in the Greek are the same as those in the Wisdom quotation): 'Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and uprightness of truth' (Eph 4^{24}). In Mt 25^{31-46} (the beginning of which recalls the Enoch quotation of Charles far more closely than Jn 5^{27}) [2] the Son of Man, though the apocalyptic judge who stands for the fall of nations, judges on the grounds of His common manhood (Mt $25^{40.\ 45}$ and above). The language in John, *krisin poiein*, recalls the *krisin krinĕ* of the Wisdom passage (Jn 5^{27}, Wis 9^{3}). The possible significance of this will appear directly.

Son of Man as Man in John. Elsewhere in Wisdom, in the passage already examined from the second chapter, the ideally righteous man is called 'Son of God' as Jesus is in John; 'For if the Righteous One is Son of God' (Wis 2^{18}). In 1 Jn 2^{1} Jesus Christ is called 'the Righteous One.' Wisdom 2^{16} declares that this righteous man 'makes his boast that God is his Father.' John 5^{18} is practically a quotation of this. The phrase 'son of God' without the article means 'divine' and occurs twice with this connotation in John: Jn 10^{36} and Jn 19^{7}. Jesus makes Himself out to be divine. It is probable that at Jn 5^{27} 'son of man' without the article means, in similar fashion, 'human,' so that, contrary to current opinion, the meaning is that Jesus judges by virtue of His manhood. The plain meaning of the argument in Jn $10^{34.\ 35}$ is that Jesus, being human, claims to be divine by analogy with the judges of old whom the word of God constituted 'gods' (10^{35}). 'We stone you for no good work but for blasphemy, because you, being a man, make yourself God' (10^{33}).[3] John's readers would be familiar with the idea expressed in Jn 5^{18} 'making himself equal with God.' The Man in *Poimandres* is equal with God His Father who is life and light (*Corpus Hermeticum*, i. 12); and St. Paul lays it down as an axiom that Christ was equal with God (Ph $2^{6.\ 7}$. The word for 'equal' here only differs from John and *Poimandres* in being used adverbially).

John, who can be shown to be familiar with Aramaic idiom,[4] was quite capable of the linguistic subtlety involved in taking 'Son of Man' as meaning 'human,' which, of course, it does mean in that language. (As we have seen, Paul in the Philippians passage probably does the same.) John is fond of using the word 'man' even where an elliptical expression would serve (for example, $5^{7.\ 12}$);[5] nevertheless his use of 'man' for Jesus is striking. Jesus presents Himself at Jerusalem as '*a man* who has told you the truth which I heard from God' (8^{40});[6] Jesus claims He is not so much a king as a witness to truth (18^{37}), and Pilate sets Him before the people as 'the man'

[1] The author of Hebrews obviously says that man exercises his rightful dominion in the person of Jesus. *Poimandres* also makes much of man's dominion: all the Father's works are handed over to him.

[2] Mt 25^{31}, 'When the Son of man comes in His glory . . . then He will sit on the throne of His glory.' John does not connect judgment with glory; with him, as in the earlier strata of the synoptics, judgment is the other side of salvation and life. 'Because he is Son of Man he can judge, sift, those who have it (*i.e.*, Life) and those who have it not (5^{25-27})'—so A. H. McNeile, *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul*, 265. But He judges by being what He is and by offering Himself as He is, and so 'judges no one.' I hope, however, to deal elsewhere with the remarkable parallel to John's teaching in the *Testament of Abraham*, xiii.

[3] Cf. Ex 22^{28}: 'Thou shalt not revile the gods, or curse a ruler of thy people.' Thornton (*The Common Life in the Body of Christ*, 403) notes the parallel between Jn 10^{30-36} and He $2^{11-13.\ 17}$. Odeberg, who realized that this question of Christ's humanity and divinity is the crucial issue, says that the Jews could have accepted an Elijah from heaven or a saint who had ascended, but not a man who was *of celestial origin*, one born of a woman who was yet a heavenly being (pp. 266, 267), yet he stumbles himself at the same teaching and gets rid of Jn $10^{34.\ 35}$ by calling the passage 'scarcely Johannine in character' (p. 333). Bernard, who also rejects the equation 'Son of Man' = Man, yet writes: 'The strict Hebrew doctrine of God left no place for the Incarnation. God and man were set over against each other, as wholly separate and distinct. But even in the Jewish Scriptures there are hints and foreshadowings of potential divinity in man (cf. Ps 82^{6}, Zech 12^{8}); and it is to this feature of Hebrew theology that attention is drawn in 10^{34}' (*op. cit.*, 368).

[4] See Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*.

[5] '*Anthropos*' may be John's way of translating an Aramaic indefinite pronoun (Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* [1954 ed.], App. C, p. 236). But there is sufficient evidence that John is playing with the word; for example, 'Behold the man!'

[6] Burkitt pointed out that the figure in the Mandean G.R. 1. 53 and I. 29, Anush or Enush (usually Anosh-Uthra) who is modelled on Jesus bears a similar character. 'Anush is the same name as the Biblical Patriarch 'Enosh (*i.e.*, "man"), but it is likely that the Mandean conception of Anush as the messenger of truth is connected with the way in which Jesus in the Gospel calls Himself Son of Man' (Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, 110).

(19[5]); the woman of Samaria calls her acquaintance to see '*a man* who told me all I ever did' (4[29]); the blind man calls Him 'the man called Jesus' (9[11]); 'this man does many miracles' (11[47]); 'one man is to die for the people' (11[50] 18[14]); being a man, He makes Himself God (10[33] and cf. 18[17. 29]).[1] The manhood of Jesus is indeed stressed more obviously and deliberately in the Fourth Gospel than in the other three, and His origin and name are stressed. His divinity is compatible with real humanity. 'They said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How can He now say, I have come down from heaven?' (6[42]). Philip tells Nathanael about Him: 'We have found Him, of whom Moses in the Law, and the prophets wrote—Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph' (1[45]). Sydney Cave wrote: 'It is a misrepresentation of the facts to describe this Gospel's portrait of Jesus as a mere Christophany. Faithfully this Gospel narrates His human weakness, His weariness at the well, His sorrow and vexation at Lazarus's death, and His thirst upon the Cross. Nor is it true to say that the evangelist depicts Jesus as immune from inner conflict, praying only for didactic purposes, Himself immune from human need. His deep emotion at the visit of the Greeks is an indication of the strain with which He accepted the burden of the Cross. His soul was troubled, and it was by prayer that He gained the calm courage needed to endure the Cross and so to consummate His work and do the Father's will (12[23-27]). Much as in this Gospel His power is emphasized, it is not an independent power. The signs He works are in answer to His prayers to God (*e.g.*, 11[41]). Of Himself, He can do nothing; His works are those which the Father gave Him to do (5[19. 36])' (Cave, *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, 61).

Son of Man and Son of God. Like the Son of Man in the Synoptics, the Johannine Son of Man exemplifies abstract principle, the principle of life through death, gain through loss. 'He who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life' (12[25]). Positively, the principle is 'He that abides in love abideth in God and God in him'—because God is love (1 Jn 4[16]). But the principle is embodied in the Son of Man first, and in others derivatively: 'abide in my love' (Jn 15[9]). So as the Servant He is the pattern of true manhood (13[14]), and in that manhood lifted up is the Image of the invisible God. Thus in John the terms Son of Man and Son of God are almost interchangeable; cf., for example, 5[19] with 8[28] and note the occasional ambiguity when 'Son' appears alone.

[1] See the curious use of '*the* man' in Jn 7[51], but cf. 12[25]. 'Man' must not in these passages be made into a title, like that of the *Anthropos*.

Yet His manhood is no abstraction, and His relation to empirical mankind not abstract. He is personal and a person, historical and yet of significance and being wider than history, to whom we are related by love, which is in fact constitutive of human unity. The Son of Man must be lifted up to draw all men to Him, as the Servant is to 'gather together into one the scattered children of God'; the seed must die in order that it may not remain solitary (12[32] 11[52]).[2] The human relation to God in John is ethical; he will call none Son except Jesus;[3] certainly not all men are children of God: they are drawn by Christ. But the only Son calls them 'brothers': 'I am going up to my Father and your Father, to my God and yours' (20[17]).[4] If, then, the Son of Man is ideal man, there is more in John than 'He became like me in order that I might receive him: he was reckoned like myself in order that I might put him on. . . . Like my nature he became that I might learn him, and like my form that I might not turn back from him' (Odes of Solomon 7[4. 6]), yet less than 'You have seen your brother, you have seen your God' (Clem. Alex., *Miscellanies*, i. 19, 94, 5). Rather the Word who is ideal Manhood is the 'light which lightens every man coming into the world.'[5] This brings us back to the idea expressed by the anonymous author of *The Way*: 'the source of our personality is the love of God deep under our consciousness.'[6] This love is brought out by contact with the Son of Man who is also the Son of God, so that not the Cross, or the kerygma, or any series of events, but the Lord Himself is salvation, and in love of Him and of each other men find fulfilment and union with God. We are always in danger of forgetting the truth of Bunyan's lines:

> Blest cross! Blest sepulchre! Blest rather be
> The Man who there was put to shame for me.

[2] Cf. He 2[10. 13]: 'many sons'; 'I and the children God has given me,' and Is 49[5], where the Servant, a 'light for the nations' is to 'gather together Jacob to him'; cf. the Light of the World in John. For the seed, see Jn 12[23. 24]; cf. 15[8].

[3] Dodd may be right that in Jn 10[35] 'although the author does not carry his quotation to the end of the sentence, it is clear that the words *huioi hupsistou* are essential to his argument' (*The Fourth Gospel*, 271, *n.* 3). Their omission is for that reason all the more significant. Cf. Jn 1[18] 3[16], 'only Son.'

[4] Cf. Ezk 11[15f.]: 'Son of man, thy brethren. . . . I shall give a new spirit . . .'; cf. He 2[12] and Ro 8[29].

[5] For this translation see Kraeling (*Anthropos and the Son of Man*, 172), Dodd (*The Fourth Gospel*, 204, *n.* 1), etc.

[6] Whether or not Leontius' doctrine of *Enhypostasia* really meant, as M. Relton (*A Study in Christology*, 69–93), tried to prove, that divine personality involves human personality, the idea is suggestive. Dodd sees in the Johannine Son of Man a challenge to discover a more adequate account of personality in God and in ourselves (*The Fourth Gospel*, 249).

Contributions and Comments

Oral Tradition

It has been suggested to me that some of your readers might be interested in an experience which I had a few years ago, which seemed to contain evidence of the reliability of oral tradition in favourable circumstances.

The founder of Christian missionary work in and around the city of Nagpur, near the centre of India, met his death by drowning in September 1863. His official biography contains a fairly detailed account of the incident, indicating how his riderless horse arrived at a late hour at the Rest House at which he was awaited by friends whom he had promised to join after preaching the gospel in a village some two miles away. A search discovered his body which had been carried some distance down a small stream which had been unexpectedly swollen by rains near its source.

When the time came to celebrate the centenary of the arrival of this missionary, some of us resolved that we ought to locate more exactly the precise place at which he had met his death. With the help of a good map and the record in the biography we chose what seemed fairly near the place and set out. It meant a cross country walk from the nearest road of about one mile. We noted, however, to our perplexity that if the biography was accurate there seemed to have been no need for Mr. Hislop (the missionary in question) to have attempted to ford the stream in which he was said to have been drowned. A ride along its right bank was what was required of him.

When we came near the spot which seemed to be indicated we called to a man working in the fields and asked him if he knew where it was that a European gentleman had been drowned some eighty years earlier. Without a moment's hesitation he set out to show us the place. As we went along we were joined by several other villagers who equally readily led us to the place in question. Very soon they indicated it—a dry backwater fringed with trees and crossed by a track which indicated its regular use. This, of course, at once cleared up the difficulty left by the written account and fitted in with what the villagers explained to us, namely, that it sometimes happened that the backwater filled up unexpectedly if there had been rain further up stream but none locally. In such circumstances there would be nothing to warn a traveller to expect water in what was normally a dry watercourse.

As we conversed we found ourselves being given a detailed account of the drowning accident of eighty years earlier, so similar to what we had read that very morning when we prepared to make our search that one might almost have thought the villagers had made a study of the book which we possessed! Each detail tallied save one, and on that one point it was obvious that the village account was right and the book inaccurate.

I was left with a remarkable impression of the sheer accuracy of an oral tradition given the necessary conditions which were present in this case. These seemed to be: (1) That the incident recalled should have been one to have made a deep impression on the people at the time. The death by drowning of a European at a time and in an area in which Europeans would be a rare sight obviously met this condition. (2) The people concerned should be accustomed to rely on memory and what is heard and not be dependent on written records. This condition also applied in a rural area in which any kind of general literacy is only now beginning to penetrate.

William Stewart

Serampore College,
Serampore, W. Bengal

Genesis xli. 40

I have read with great interest the opinion of the Rev. Norman Adcock in The Expository Times (lxvii. [September, 1956] 383) about the meaning of יִשַּׁק. His proposal that יִשַּׁק must be retained because it gives expression to the Egyptian word *sn* (kiss), which can also be translated with 'eat' (or 'feed'), is quite interesting. It is possible that Mr. Adcock is not conscious of the fact that this proposal was originally initiated by Yahuda (*Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Aegyptischen* [1929], 6 ff.). He was followed by Aalders in his Dutch commentary [1949] and by the translators of the new Dutch Bible [1952]. As far as my knowledge goes Yahuda was the first scholar of modern times to point this out. It is also interesting to know that this translation is lacking in the ancient versions, the Jubilees and Josephus. But we find it in the Targum of Onkelos, where the Aramaic word זוּן is used in the *itpe'el* imperfect to mean 'be nourished.'

Although this proposal can be accepted as the clearest solution up to now, it is better to be

cautious and not to accept it as the only solution. The following must be born in mind: (*a*) the common Egyptian word for 'eat' is *wnm*, and (*b*) that *sn* is usually used with an object which is missing in Genesis.

F. C. FENSHAM

University of Stellenbosch, South Africa

Lucan Sources

The generous assessment by Dr. Vincent Taylor (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxviii. [December 1956] 95) of my examination of pre-synoptic sources in Lk 21–24 (*Studia Theologica*, VIII. ii. [1954] 138–72) compels me to mention the fact that the article in question contains in some places inaccuracies, or even mistakes. Disregarding several printing errors, I should like to correct two points.

Whilst I still adhere to the opinion that Lk 21^{20-24} is in essence the Evangelist's adaptation of an oracle from the time of the investment of Jerusalem by Roman armies, supplemented by insertions from Mark, I am now inclined to think that the words ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν in *v.* 24 are the Evangelist's own addition to the source which he used (*Studia Theologica*, 151).

My examination of Lk 23^{50-56} (*Studia Theologica*, 166) was somewhat sketchy; the passage should be reformulated as follows:

> 'In this section we have the Evangelist's redrafting of Mk 15^{42-47}. The editor makes minor transpositions and he supplements Mark with information derived from the same source to which Lk $23^{48.\ 49}$ belonged.'

These details alter nothing in the general outline of the method in which the Third Evangelist used and treated sources that were at his disposal.

I wish to express at this place my satisfaction that my article has found the agreement of Professor Taylor and my gratitude for his kindly given encouragement.

PAUL WINTER

London

The Cry of Dereliction

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of August last (page 321) you comment on a book *The Passion of the King* by Dr. F. C. Grant. His discussion regarding the Cry of Dereliction, prompts me to the following thoughts.

I once had a ministerial friend whose prayers contained scarcely a phrase which was not Scriptural. If I had said to him, 'Brother, I never knew anyone whose prayers were more completely built up of Scriptural quotations,' he would have looked at me in amazement. For though his phrases were wholly Scriptural, he really was not quoting at all. He had lived in the Bible all his life: he could scarcely express his inner longings and desires except in Scriptural language. It was even so, it would seem to me, with our Lord.

When on the Cross He felt acutely His isolation from God and man. 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a cross' was a statement with which He had long been familiar. He felt alone, deserted: and He said so: in Scriptural words. But He was not quoting at all.

Fortunately the mood of abandonment passed. 'Into Thy Hands I commend My Spirit.' These words were the triumph of that faith in God His Father which He had always possessed and which He had repeatedly urged on others. That complete trust never seemed to be less justified: but it was never more firmly asserted. That assertion, an act of faith if ever there was one, meant that He had finally routed every temptation to doubt or waver: and it closed His earthly life. His faith had overcome the world.

That is why He is the Saviour of the world, and my faith in Him unlocks for me the treasure of that victory, and He becomes my Saviour. He is the Saviour of all who allow Him to fashion their reactions to the world around them.

I do not feel at home in the discussion by Dr. Grant.

WILLIAM BLIGHT

Papanui, New Zealand

Recent Foreign Theology

Christian Disinterestedness. The French Communist, Thorez, once contrasted Christian morality, inspired by the hope of reward after death, with the disinterested self-sacrifice of Communists, who are without thought of self. From this observation the French Jesuit, G. Didier, takes his departure for a study of the Pauline teaching in this connexion.[1] He takes the various epistles one by one, and examines the Apostle's demands and their motivation. He concludes that while the rewards of obedience to the law of Christ are often set

[1] *Désintéressement du Chrétien: La rétribution dans la morale de Saint Paul* [1955]. Editions Montaigne, Aubier; Fr. 840.

before men, and the element of threat is not lacking, these can easily be exaggerated, as they often have been in Christian teaching, both Catholic and Protestant. There is privilege in Christian service, which it is idle to ignore, but the ultimate Christian appeal is not to selfishness. Paul would have been ready to sacrifice his own salvation, if he could thereby have won his Jewish brethren, and he summons men to share the mind of Christ, who sacrificed Himself, not for His own sake but for the sake of others. The Christian who is truly in Christ shares the love of Christ for the world, and enters into the sufferings of Christ through that love for men. For him Heaven is life with Christ, and in abandoning himself to Christ he knows something of its joy here and now. His love for Christ is not inspired so much by the thought of what he will get, as by the realization of what Christ has done. It is the response to love. Yet love in loving is ever enriched. This is the paradox of all love. It finds its satisfaction in giving itself to its object, but if it is selfishly obsessed with what it gets, it ceases to be love and misses its goal.

Jerusalem. The second volume of the *magnum opus* on the Old Testament Jerusalem by Vincent and Steve has now appeared.[1] It contains parts 2 and 3 of the work, and is accompanied by a collection of forty-nine plates separately enclosed. Of the veteran Father L. H. Vincent's eminence as a Palestine archaeologist there can be no two opinions, and his long residence in Jerusalem gives anything he writes on this city a special authority. In the present volume he traces first the history of the Temple, and then the history of the city. The Temple of Solomon and the Temple of Herod are first considered, after which the author turns to reconstruct the Temple of Ezekiel, and the Temple as it figures in the Mishnah. As every one knows the Temple site cannot be excavated, since it is now occupied by a Mohammedan mosque, or greater control of the Biblical data by archaeological research might be achieved. In the final chapters of this section Father Vincent writes on the Ḥaram on the site of the ancient Temple and on what can be gleaned of the adaptation of the Temple to the Ḥaram.

In the second part of the volume he studies the history of the city in the light of archaeology and the Bible from the earliest times to the Second Revolt and the foundation of Aelia Capitolina. The story is divided into the following periods: before David, from David to the Exile, from the Exile to the Restoration, from the Restoration to Herod, from Herod to the First Revolt, the First Revolt, and from A.D. 70 to the time of Bar Cochba. The work is superbly produced, and must long continue to be a standard work. Its author is acquainted with all the sources of knowledge of ancient Jerusalem yet available, and while certainty on many questions is unattainable his informed judgment is second to none.

---

1 and 2 Thessalonians. A massive commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians has been published in the famous series of *Études Bibliques*.[2] The author is Béda Rigaux, who published an important work on Antichrist more than twenty years ago.[3] The introduction to the present commentary occupies more than three hundred pages, and it deals fully with every question. The historical background of Paul's missionary career and a careful analysis of the contents of the two Epistles are set out before more special questions are considered. The authenticity of both Epistles is accepted, after careful examination of alternative views, and their early date is defended. The first Epistle is dated in A.D. 51, and the second is thought to have been written a few months after the first. There are valuable chapters on the literary style, with the examination of literary affinities, on the Parousia, and on the text of the Epistles. The author also gives a history of the exegesis of these Epistles, in which a vast amount of bibliographical information will be found, in addition to eighteen pages of bibliography at the beginning of the work. Full indexes are supplied at the end of the volume.

The commentary proper occupies another three hundred pages. The Greek text and French translation face one another, and there is a full critical apparatus and the voluminous commentary beneath the text. A vast amount of research has gone into the preparation of this volume, and it is doubtful if a more complete study of these Epistles can be found in any other work. It will be quite indispensable for any future study of the Epistles. It is curious that the author uniformly gives the names of two British scholars incorrectly, James Moffat and T. W. Mansion for Moffatt and Manson.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University

---

[1] *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament: Recherches d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, 2nd and 3rd parts [1956]. Gabalda, Paris; Fr. 11·500.

[2] *Les Épitres aux Thessaloniciens* [1956]. Gabalda, Paris, and Duculot, Gembloux; Fr. 3,600.

[3] *L'Antichrist et l'Opposition au Royaume messianique dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament* [1932].

Entre Nous

Dr. Major and The Modern Churchman

With the December, 1956 number of *The Modern Churchman* Dr. Major makes his farewell to the Journal that he founded in 1911. We congratulate him on his long, fine record as Editor and regret that he feels the time has come to hand over to others.

As Editor, as Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, as the effective leader of the Modern Churchmen's Union, as the author of several notable volumes, and as a considerable controversialist, Dr. Major was for many years the leading protagonist of the liberal idea in the Church of England. In his farewell issue of *The Modern Churchman* he sums up in few sentences what the idea involved. Making use of a phrase of Sir William Ashley's 'coming out into the open' he says 'Our Modernist Anglican coming out is really a process of entering more fully into what is involved by membership in the Church of England. It is a progressive realization of its essential character: what is demanded by membership in that Church: the feet of its members are set in a wide room. Love of freedom, love of Divine Life unveiled in Beauty, Art, History are all included in their goodly heritage to be realized, protected, developed and bequeathed to all under the progressive guidance of the Holy Spirit: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."'

Dr. Major goes on to say that this 'responsible spiritual freedom is of the essential character of the Church of England.' He will take heart now from the fact that those who are carrying on his work have undertaken to see that the tradition he instituted, and guarded with the jealousy of a devotee for so long a time, is continued in the same spirit.

The Modern Pilgrim

One of the most constant needs of the Church is clear, concise, simple, vivid and practical teaching of just what it means to be a Christian, and therefore to be a member of the Church. Any one who proposes to give that teaching will not be saying new things; he will be presenting old things in such a way that people must listen to them. He will not be speaking *nova* but *nove*. This is precisely what William Purcell does in *Pilgrim's Programme* (Collins; 10s. 6d. net).

Mr. Purcell begins by distinguishing four attitudes to religion. (1) There are those who believe in and live by the faith that is in them. They know what it means and they have the blessed certainty. (2) There are those who are actively hostile to the Church, those who disbelieve in Christianity and who know quite clearly why they hate it. (3) There are those who have no very strong feelings either way. They are not hostile, but they do not believe that religion matters. Religion for them is merely irrelevant. (4) There are those who are called by Mr. Purcell *the floating voters*. 'If they were faced with a voting-card for or against belief in God they would place their cross in the affirmative square, and then wonder wistfully if it was true.' They would like it to be true, but they can never be sure. It is for the floating voter this book is written. And such people need this book. In preaching there tends to be any amount of exhortation to be Christian, but there is not nearly enough exposition of what being Christian means, and this book is an entirely successful attempt to make good that want.

Mr. Purcell takes as his pattern the seven points in which the Archbishops of Canterbury and York set out the Christian duty. (1) To follow the example of Christ in home and daily life, and to bear personal witness to Him. (2) To be regular in private prayer day by day. (3) To read the Bible carefully. (4) To come to Church every Sunday. (5) To receive the Holy Communion faithfully and regularly. (6) To give personal service to Church, neighbours and community. (7) To give money for the work of the parish and diocese and for the work of the Church at home and overseas. Mr. Purcell discusses these duties one by one. We shall look at his discussion of the demand to come to Church every Sunday.

To go to Church is a triple duty.

(1) It is a man's duty to himself. A man must worship something, and if he does not worship God he will probably deify himself. If he does that, he impoverishes his own personality, by stifling an essential part of himself. 'Worship is man's response to God's love.' Man being man, and God being God, that must be a response of reverence and praise. A man will find no gods to reverence in the world, therefore if he fails to reverence the true God he is denying an essential need of his own nature.

(2) It is man's duty to his neighbour. 'No man,' as John Donne said, 'is an island.' Every man is responsible for what he does—and he is responsible for what he does not do. A person in whose life there is no example and no witness can be just as socially damaging as a man whose sins are much more dramatically obvious. Church-going is an

act of witness to the fact that God matters, and, if ever the belief that God matters goes from life, so does the splendour of life.

(3) These may be pedestrian reasons for going to Church. That is as it should be. 'True religion always has its feet on the ground: that is one reason why it can continue with safety to have its head in the air.' But with the third reason we reach a new sphere—to go to Church is a duty to God. We have to ask two questions. First, What is man? Man is the creature for whom God sent His Son, and man is the creature who has dominion over the works of God's hands (Ps 8). Therefore not to worship God 'is a failure in loving recognition. It is a cutting dead by the child of his own father.' And to worship, on the other hand, is to recognize our position as children of God. Second, What is the Church? The Church is a family whose head is Christ. It is a very ancient family, and a very large family, with a vast genealogical tree. True, it may be a divided family; but in any branch it exists for three things—'to worship, to teach the faith, and to bring to bear through the action of its members, acting as Christ's agents upon earth, the way of Christ upon the way of the world.' That is well said—and it is equally well pointed out that none of these things can be carried out in isolation; they must all be corporate acts.

The recognition of this threefold demand, and the reasons for it must be 'stiffened by a sense of duty.' 'We cannot expect always to feel like going to Church. . . . What is fatal is to leave it entirely to the inclinations as to whether we do so or not. . . . It cannot be treated as a hobby.' There must be in this a sense of obligation.

Mr. Purcell is no advocate of Sabbatarianism. He sees three arguments against Sabbatarianism. (1) It is Jewish rather than Christian. (2) 'With its emphasis on restriction it can only too easily encourage gloom where there should be gladness.' (3) If we too clearly draw the line between what can be done on Sunday and other days, it tends to make religion a thing of one day, and not of seven days. But, nevertheless, however different it may make us from other people, we must see to it that there is on Sunday 'a different tempo from the rest of the week,' if for no other reason than for 'the hygiene of living.'

To the Church there must be given three things. (1) A loyalty which may well involve patience and forbearance. (2) A readiness to learn what the Christian way means. (3) A readiness to do and so to turn faith into action.

It can well be seen how close-packed this book is. This is a brave and an honest book. There could be no better book to put into the hands of those who are being prepared for full membership of the Church; and if any man used it as a basis for a series of sermons on the Church, he would not only educate his people, but he would also rekindle his faith in and devotion to the Church which he has been called to serve.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

'He bore the sin of many'

'In what sense did Jesus, like the servant in the prophecy, bear the sin of many? And how can His sufferings be spoken of as the consequence of this sin-bearing? . . . Perhaps it would be best to begin with a contemporary incident. A man who, during the War, had been captured by the Japanese and whom the Japanese had maltreated badly, was asked, when it was all over, how he had felt at the time, what feelings were uppermost and characteristic, was it hatred, anger, disgust, the desire for revenge? "No," the man replied, "No, I felt . . . ashamed, terribly ashamed." This man felt himself bound to his tormentors by the humanity which he and they shared in common, and therefore, in some real sense, he felt responsible for what they did. He felt implicated in the guilt of their brutality, and was ashamed of it in a way in which they would probably have found it impossible to comprehend.' [1]

Belgian Congo Missionaries

In *Missionary Diary* (noticed in 'Entre Nous' in the April number) Major Ruth Siegfried, the author, told in passing that the Salvation Army was called in the Belgian Congo *Mondele Na Njame* — 'the Whites of the Lord' — other missionaries being known as *Na Anglaises*. Now the Rev. Lionel G. West, who has spent twenty-six years in the Belgian Congo, writes to correct this. He says, 'It is quite true that "All Protestant missionaries" are called *Na Anglaises*, but I would add the Salvation Army included.' And he says 'we missionaries are all called "*mindele na Njambe*," "*mondele*" is the singular form. It may be that some of Miss Siegfried's élèves have referred to the Salvation Army as "The Whites of the Lord," but I feel sure that these same élèves if they were with other missionaries of other Societies would also speak of them as "Whites of the Lord" or, as our folk of the Equatorial zone would say, "People of God."'

[1] H. A. Williams, in *Good Friday at St. Margaret's*, 57 f.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.